Vindication of the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Unjust



Joseph Harvey Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2
TABLE OF CONTENTS 4
PREFACE 5
THE RESURRECTION OF THE UNJUST 7
- DISTINCTION OF “BLOOD-LIFE” A FALLACY 15
- THEIR THEORY OF THE TWO RESURRECTIONS 16
- DOUBLE INFLICTION OF THE PENALTY 19
- “WHAT SAY THE SCRIPTURES?” 22

APPENDIX 68
PUBLICATIONS 71
- BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND TRACTS 72

BY J. H. WAGGONER.

"And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."-*Acts 24:15*.

STEAM PRESS
OF THE SEVENTH ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.
1870

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
THE RESURRECTION OF THE UNJUST	5
APPENDIX	97
PUBLICATIONS	100

PREFACE

The following pages contain a clear, concise, and able argument in vindication of the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked. It is proper to state that an earnest effort is being made by a considerable portion of the first-day Adventists to promulgate the doctrine that the wicked dead are never to be resurrected. No thoughtful reader of the Bible will pronounce this question one of small consequence. It involves the interpretation of a very large part of the Bible. The doctrine of the judgment, and of final retribution, of which the Scriptures say so much, is entirely changed in character according as we decide that the wicked shall or shall not be resurrected. We can hardly imagine what special good would grow out of the doctrine could its truthfulness be established. For the doctrine that the wicked shall be resurrected that they may each receive such measure of indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, as their crimes severally deserve, satisfies our sense of justice. And the doctrine that this torment, or anguish, shall result in death, relieves the subject of all sense of disproportion between the crime and the punishment that burdens the doctrine of endless torment. But this theory of the non-resurrection of the wicked leaves our sense of justice on the part of God toward impenitent men entirely unsatisfied, and is no measure called for as our only escape from the unreasonable doctrine of endless torment. *VDRU 3.1*

But, if this doctrine be false, it is certainly a very serious error. To teach wicked men that they shall never be called forth from their graves to receive the second death, will prove to such persons an awful mistake should the Son of God actually call them forth to final retribution. *VDRU 4.1*

The fact, therefore, that the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked is being extensively and zealously promulgated at the present time, makes it a matter of great importance that this subject should be fairly and thoroughly canvassed. We commend the following work as an able vindication of the doctrine of the resurrection of the unjust. *VDRU 4.2*

TRUSTEES

Of S. D. A. Pub. Association.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE UNJUST

Will the wicked dead be raised? This question is exciting considerable interest in certain localities; and some are embracing the view that the wicked will not have a resurrection. The opinions of the parties for and against this view may be briefly stated, as follows:*VDRU 5.1*

I. For: (1) The wages of sin being death, when the wicked die, the full penalty of the law is inflicted upon them; and it would not be just for God to raise them up to execute the same penalty upon them a second time.*VDRU 5.2*

(2) Life is promised only through Christ, and obtained only by faith; and therefore those who reject Christ will not have life given to them in a resurrection.*VDRU 5.3*

(3) The Scriptures say they shall not see light; shall not see life; shall not rise; etc.*VDRU 5.4*

The first two points embrace the principles on which they profess to base their faith. The third embraces the facts or Scripture declarations supposed to sustain the principles.*VDRU 5.5*

II. Against: (1) All mankind die on account of Adam's transgression, and not on account of their personal sins.*VDRU 5.6*

(2) Justice demands a resurrection of the wicked, in order to the infliction of the penalty of their personal sins.*VDRU 5.7*

(3) The Scriptures declare that there will be a resurrection of the unjust; of them that have done evil; all shall be made alive; they shall die the second death.*VDRU 6.1*

Eld. George Storrs, of New York, who has in a manner led off in the non-resurrection theory, being the only one who has published any considerable work on the subject, commences his argument with an effort to establish a "principle." To this no one would object; indeed, it is the best of all methods of reasoning to first establish the principles of a doctrine. But in reasoning upon the Bible, we must be careful that our principles are in harmony with its plain teachings;

for it is frequently the case that men announce as “principles” the mere expression of their own ideas. So Prof. Finney, of Ohio, in his discussion with Charles Fitch, laid down principles to prove the millennium, by which he endeavored to make that doctrine a necessity to vindicate the benevolence of God; but in so doing he contradicted some of the plainest declarations of the Bible. So Calvinists or fatalists found their “principles” on their own limited ideas of God’s foreknowledge and decrees, and thereby set aside the abundance of Scripture testimony which shows the freedom of the human will in choosing or rejecting eternal life. I think Mr. Storrs has erred in precisely the same manner, allowing him to be the expositor of his own principle. To understand his exposition, we must read his principle. It is as follows:*VDRU 6.2*

“Gifts may exceed the promise; but punishment cannot justly exceed the threatening. Thus, a prince may give to a worthy subject ten thousand dollars as a gratuity; but a just prince cannot, and will not, inflict a punishment more severe than the clearly expressed penalty, or inflict a thousand stripes gratuitously. So God may give a revival into life, and make that life eternal to a faithful servant, even though he had never clearly informed him that he would do so; but he could not, in punishing, justly exceed some known penalty, or penalty clearly indicated.”*VDRU 7.1*

With this I find no fault; but unfortunately he has not reasoned in harmony with it, but has assumed a penalty never indicated in the Scriptures; and his conclusions are drawn, not from any just principle, but from his own assumption in regard to the penalty. In his argument he says:*VDRU 7.2*

“The wages of sin, then, is not suffering, but death. It is not dying, but death. It is not the pain of dying, but to have life extinguished-*to be dead:* that only is death.... No pangs, no struggles, nor agonies, connected with dying, are death, or any part of death.”*VDRU 7.3*

In this I think Mr. Storrs has departed widely from Bible truth; and in his effort to prove what God *must* or *ought to* do, in order to be just, he has directly contradicted what God says he *will* do. And if it shall appear that his exposition is thus defective, the conclusion drawn therefrom may well be called in question. Let us consider it:*VDRU*

7.4

1. Our ideas of the penalty of the law must always stand corrected by the exposition and practice of the divine Lawgiver. His first announcement of the penalty was this: “Thou shalt surely die.” But Mr. Storrs says it is not dying, but “to be dead.” If so, it should read, Thou shalt surely *be dead.* The soul that sinneth, it shall *be dead.* The wages of sin is *to be dead.* But such terms are never used in the Scriptures. The phrase, *shalt die,* clearly points to the *process* whereby he should *become dead.* I am aware that this statement of Mr. Storrs’ is often reiterated in controversies on the subject of life and death; but it is erroneous nevertheless. “The soul that sinneth, it *shall die*”-not *shall be dead.* Now if Mr. Storrs could devise some means whereby the sinner can *be dead* without undergoing the process of *dying,* then with more show of reason might he endeavor to disconnect the “pangs, struggles, and agonies, connected with dying,” from the penalty. But the divine expressions include the process of dying-shalt die-and his assertion contradicts both reason and Scripture. I do not deny that the penalty reaches to the state of being dead; for there is no such thing as death, unless that consummation be reached. But I do deny that it excludes the act of dying, with its pangs and agonies. Both are included in the penalty.*VDRU 8.1*

2. If “to be dead” were alone the penalty, and the pangs, etc, of death, were “not the penalty or any part of it,” then all the “pangs, struggles, and agonies, connected with” the infliction of the penalty, death, are so much over and above the penalty, and of course, according to Mr. Storrs’ showing, so much of manifest injustice on the part of the Being who inflicts the penalty! And it would therefore be necessary for God to insure an easy, peaceful death, to the sinner, in order that he might *be dead,* in accordance with justice, that is, without having added to the “penalty clearly indicated,” “pangs, struggles, or agonies,” which are no part of the penalty, and cannot, therefore, be justly inflicted! But against this I say,*VDRU 8.2*

3. God has not only threatened *death* to the evil-doer, but he has also threatened “tribulation and *anguish,” torment* with fire and brimstone, *plagues,* with *grievous sores* and *pains.* And all the illustrations given in the Scriptures, of the justice and wrath of God

against sin, include such ideas as these. Now these are the desert of sin, and part of its penalty, or they are not. If they are, then Mr. Storrs' exposition of principles is without foundation in truth. But if they are not, as Mr. Storrs asserts, then, according to his theory, these threats can never be fulfilled without God thereby proving himself unjust! *VDRU 9.1*

Such is the tendency of Mr. Storrs' position on which he bases his non-resurrection theory. As said before, we may well call in question any argument based on such premises, or conclusion drawn from them. *VDRU 9.2*

In regard to principles, the question first to be settled in this controversy is this: Do mankind now die because of their own sins, or because of the sin of their representative head, Adam? There are, I think, weighty reasons to be offered on both branches of this question; that is, that they do not die on account of their own sins, and that they do die on account of Adam's transgression. And this conclusion is deducible from the principles of just reasoning, from the statements of the Scriptures, and from the admissions of those opposing. *VDRU 10.1*

"In Adam all die," are the words of inspiration. This certainly does not admit of any exceptions. All men stood in Adam, their representative. So says Mr. Curry, a leading advocate of that faith; "Every one having this Adamic nature, dies. *In* Adam: every one who has that Adamic condition must necessarily die by virtue of that condition." *Debate with Grant,* p. 24. But all classes and ages have that Adamic condition; hence, all classes and ages "die by virtue of that condition;" and this, of course, without any regard to their character. Mr. Storrs denies that *1 Corinthians 15:22*, has any reference to "all men;" yet he does not deny the fact that all men do actually die in Adam, but states it in the following words: "And though it is *a* truth that all men die by a connection with the first Adam, yet that is not *the* truth the apostle now proceeds to state." *Life from the Dead,* p. 48. And again, the same is admitted on page 49, as follows: "It is by connection with Adam, as descendants from him, that death came to those whose personal sins are forgiven." In these statements, both Mr. Curry and Mr. Storrs admit that mankind do *not* now die on account of their personal sins. For if the present

prevailing death is the penalty of personal sin, by what principle of justice do they suffer that penalty after their personal sins are forgiven? Do they really believe that God executes the penalty of sins after they are forgiven? If so, in what consists their forgiveness? And here, against this non-resurrection theory, I bring this charge, that it entirely ignores the gospel doctrine of the remission of sins, and contradicts every statement of the Scriptures in regard to forgiveness. In this it stands in direct opposition to the gospel system.*VDRU 10.2*

In some States, the death penalty stands against murder; but do they ever hang a man after he is pardoned? The words, or offer, of pardon in such a case would be senseless, cruel mockery. According to the theory we call in question, the righteous, or justified, suffer the same penalty that the wicked suffer. Do they first receive the pardon, or forgiveness, of their sins, and then suffer, to the full extent, their penalty? Is this the manner in which justice is administered in the divine government?*VDRU 11.1*

That this is no misapprehension of the non-resurrection dogma, no unjust conclusion drawn from the premises of an opponent, will appear by a quotation from Mr. Curry, “Debate with Grant,” page*VDRU 11.2*

101: “The life that now is, is under the law, goes down under the law; the law holds it. *There is no way to escape the penalty.”* And therefore, if this penalty is the penalty of personal sins, as he elsewhere avers, there is no way to escape from the penalty of personal sins; and therefore, again, there is no such thing as forgiveness. And so it is in direct antagonism to the gospel.*VDRU 12.1*

But, it may he objected, the penitent believer does not remain dead; he is resuscitated, and eternal life is given to him.*VDRU 12.2*

But that does not meet the case; that result comes under another head. The question now before us is this: *Is there any forgiveness in the gospel?* Mr. Curry said, “There is no way to escape from the penalty;” which is equivalent to declaring that there is no way to obtain forgiveness. For I assert, without any fear of contradiction, that the forgiveness of sin and the execution of its penalty cannot

exist together. Whatever may be granted by way of gift *after* the penalty is executed, cannot interfere with the statements here made; for such gift is not mercy, not forgiveness-it is benevolence. "The soul that sinneth *it shall die;"* the soul that is forgiven its sin *shall also die.* And it does also die, and very often under far more agonizing circumstances than the other. How can the Scriptures be reconciled, and the justice of God's government be vindicated, if *the same death* is threatened to the sinner that the justified saints are daily suffering? The full penalty of the law is executed upon both alike. There is no forgiveness to any. Conceding that faith will procure a revivifying after the penalty is inflicted, it yet remains that faith and repentance will not avert the infliction of the penalty. Such is the tendency and unavoidable result of this doctrine of the non-resurrection of the unjust. *VDRU 12.3*

In justice to Eld. Rufus Wendell, of Salem, Mass., editor of the *Bible Repository,* I ought to say, that when, by request, I presented this objection to a company in the "Life Tent," on the Springfield Camp Ground, he promptly repudiated the view held by Elders Storrs and Curry on this point. In so doing he made the proper distinction between *benevolence* and *mercy.* I hope all of that party will soon do themselves the justice to renounce a theory so utterly subversive of the essential characteristics of the gospel of Christ. *VDRU 13.1*

The points of the argument on the reason of the present death may be stated as follows: *VDRU 13.2*

1. Present or "first death" is not the penalty of personal transgression to infants, as they have no personal sin to die for; they die "in Adam," or by virtue of their relation to him. *VDRU 13.3*

2. Present or "first death" is not the penalty of personal sins to the justified, their transgressions having been forgiven, and, of course, are not punishable. Therefore this death is to them also solely the result of their relation to Adam. *VDRU 13.4*

3. All the wicked sustain the same relation to Adam that do infants and saints; they are subject to the same "Adamic condition." This is conceded. And therefore they die "by virtue of that relation," as do infants and saints, and not on account of their personal sins. They who deny this third point, or maintain the contrary, are justly held to

prove that the wicked do not sustain that same relation to Adam, and are not subject to its consequences, as are infants and saints. This we do not think they will undertake. But they must see that a failure on their part here involves their whole system.*VDRU 13.5*

4. Present or "first death" cannot be *both* the penalty of personal sins, and the result of our relation to Adam; for we are offered the remission of personal sins through repentance and faith in Christ, but never the remission of that Adamic condition-no degree of repentance and faith will change that relation, or avert its consequences. This, all will and must admit. But the punishment of personal sins may be averted, according to the plain declarations and promises of the gospel. What may be predicated of one cannot be predicated of the other; therefore one death cannot stand for both. Any effort on their part to avoid our conclusion on this point, must involve them in the following contradiction: That which is visited upon *all men* by reason of a certain relation, is visited upon *one class* solely by reason of that relation, and upon *another class* not by virtue of that relation at all, but for an entirely different reason!*VDRU 14.1*

Mr. Curry, as well as Mr. Storrs, professed to place his first and chief reliance on "principles." The following is one laid down by him:*VDRU 14.2*

"God cannot be just and restore to man his animal or blood life, as that life is *forfeited* to the law." *Debate,* p. 91.*VDRU 15.1*

The same idea is held out by Mr. Storrs. But they must certainly have singular ideas of justice, as announced in such a "principle;" for they have every one of *the justified* paying the *same forfeit* that *the condemned* have to pay! Now "justification" and "condemnation" are terms expressing *different relations to law;* and I assert that where there is *no condemnation* there can be *no forfeit* required according to justice. This must be granted-it is self-evident. Therefore those who advocate this non-resurrection theory, must admit that this forfeit is not because of personal sins, or, otherwise, maintain that a person is both justified and condemned at the same time, which is an evident absurdity. I do not see how the "Judge of all the earth" can be honored by the announcement of such a

“principle,” subversive as it is of the plainest principles of justice. For let it be remembered, that God is *just in justifying* the believer (*Romans 3:26*), but not according to their position. There can be no justice in the infliction of penalties without discrimination; visiting the same judgment upon the condemned and the justified; upon those accountable and guilty; and upon those unaccountable and those whose sins have been pardoned. *VDRU 15.2*

But if all die-old and young, just and unjust-on account of their relation to Adam, and all personal sins are referred to that day when “God shall bring every work into judgment,” then all is clear, and God’s justice is vindicated. *VDRU 15.3*

And if, as I think is clearly the truth, the present or “first death” is the result of our relation to Adam, and not the penalty of personal sins, then it follows that the penalty of personal sins will never be inflicted if there shall be no revival or resurrection of the wicked, who have exposed themselves to divine justice by their actions. And so justice points unmistakably to a “resurrection of damnation,” and to a “second death,” to such as have neither sought for immortality, nor died for their own personal sins. So far as a dispute on “principles” is concerned, I claim precedence for those advanced in favor of the resurrection of the wicked. And the admissions of opponents that all now die by reason of their relation to Adam are, virtually, admissions that the justice of God remains to be vindicated in regard to their personal sins. *VDRU 16.1*

DISTINCTION OF "BLOOD-LIFE" A FALLACY

Both Mr. Storrs and Mr. Curry make a point and lay much stress on the supposed distinction between the "blood-life" and "spirit-life;" their position being that the blood-life is forfeited to the law, and that the law, as a matter of justice, holds it forever; that the life that is laid down in death is not taken up again in the resurrection, but *another* or spirit-life is conferred in its stead. The fallacy of this has already been shown in that it makes the *justified* pay the *same forfeit* as the *condemned,* which is unjust. To further show its erroneousness, I will compare their statements with those of the Scriptures. Said Mr. Curry:*VDRU 16.2*

"How was it with Christ? He laid down his blood-life, made an atonement, but he never took it up again. That was the *purchase, the forfeit." Debate with Grant,* p. 91.*VDRU 17.1*

And Mr. Storrs says:*VDRU 17.2*

"It was the *price paid;* his blood-life is laid down forever, and is never taken again." *Life from the Dead,* p. 92.*VDRU 17.3*

But the words of the Saviour stand directly opposed to these assumptions. He says:*VDRU 17.4*

"I lay down my life that I might take it again.... I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." *John 10:17, 18*.*VDRU 17.5*

This expression—"take *it again*"—shows that no such distinction obtains in the Scriptures. If he laid down *one* life and never took it *again,* but took *another* in its stead, as they assert, then this language of the Saviour is most unhappily chosen. And as the Saviour's statement is as plain and explicit as theirs, and directly contradicts theirs, I must conclude that their view was never drawn from the Bible, but was gotten up to meet the necessity of their theory.*VDRU 17.6*

THEIR THEORY OF THE TWO RESURRECTIONS

The fact that there are two "orders" of the*VDRU 17.7*

2 resurrection, or two resurrections in point of time, seems to stand out so prominently in the Scriptures that they are constrained to admit it; but they will not admit that the last, or second, is of "the unjust;" of them "that have done evil;" of the "rest" in distinction from the "blessed and holy." But admitting the fact of a second resurrection, they have had to contradict themselves and deny their o w n *invulnerable principles* to maintain their denial that this resurrection is of the wicked.*VDRU 17.8*

See the following statements. Says Mr. Storrs:*VDRU 18.1*

"Apart from Christ, when a man dies, he dies in his sins, and has lost his life never to find it again." *Life from the Dead,* p. 33.*VDRU 18.2*

"Thus the resurrection of the dead to life belongs to Christ and his body, the church-all true believers, under whatever dispensation they may have lived; and from this revival into life all others, it seems to us, are absolutely excluded." *Id.,* p. 35.*VDRU 18.3*

"Life from the dead is a peculiarity of the gospel-a gospel benefit-and believers only live again." *Id.,* p. 27.*VDRU 18.4*

But in commenting on *Revelation 20:5*, he says:*VDRU 18.5*

"If the text were a genuine one, it would be easy to show that it may not embrace the *unholy* at all. It might refer to the living again of the virtuous heathen, who had never heard of Christ, and therefore had not suffered for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God; hence, were not embraced in the 'first resurrection,' but are to have life afterwards; for surely, 'in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness'—according to the light he has—'is accepted with him,' and will have life through Jesus, though he had never heard of him." *Id.,* pp. 70, 71.*VDRU 18.6*

Dropping the paradoxical idea of the *heathen* who fear God and work righteousness! we notice that, according to Eld. Storrs, (1) A

resurrection is a *peculiarity* of the gospel, and of course is inadmissible outside the gospel. (2) It belongs to the church-to believers in Christ, only, and all others are absolutely excluded. But (3), The second resurrection "may embrace" a class who were not believers in Christ, who never heard of him. Peter's testimony in *Acts 10*, clearly proves that the faithfully obedient in all nations-Jews and Gentiles-are accepted with God; but Cornelius had the gospel message sent to him to teach him what he ought to do. To refer to these facts and circumstances to prove the salvation of those who have no faith, is a manifest perversion of the Scriptures. That any one of Mr. Storrs' ability and power of discrimination should put forth sentiments so unscriptural and self-contradictory, is strong evidence of the weakness of the theory he advocates.*VDRU 19.1*

And Mr. Curry, who seemed to closely follow Mr. Storrs, is equally unfortunate in his expressions on this subject. He laid down the following as an "unanswerable principle:"*VDRU 19.2*

"There is no future life without justification, and justification comes by faith alone." *Debate,* p. 106.*VDRU 19.3*

And again he said:*VDRU 20.1*

"That is the true, Christian, orthodox, Protestant doctrine-justification by faith; and I contend that there is no other justification in the Bible, and without justification there can be no future life." *Id.,* p. 77.*VDRU 20.2*

After thus emphatically confining a future life to those who are justified by faith in Christ, he says:*VDRU 20.3*

"May it not be that he will save a great many righteous *heathen,* though they are not saved at his coming? That there will be a second resurrection of the righteous? Is it not possible? It has no difficulty with me. And I believe the resurrection will be one of the virtuous heathen, but not of the wicked dead. And so I preach it." *Id.,* p. 75.*VDRU 20.4*

But of the heathen he says, in another place:*VDRU 20.5*

“The gospel does not address itself to the heathen. They come under a law peculiar to themselves.” *Id.,* p. 89.*VDRU 20.6*

Here again we notice that, (1) There is no justification in the Bible, except by faith. (2) There is no future life without justification. But (3), There is a future life to those who have no faith. And it is no relief from the contradiction to say the gospel does not address itself to them; for then I inquire, Where does he get his knowledge of a resurrection unto life outside the gospel? His declaration admits that it is not “in the Bible.” Then by what authority does he “preach it?” It is certainly no recommendation to the non-resurrection theory that its advocates have to invent “another gospel” to accommodate it!*VDRU 20.7*

I read that “all the world” stand condemned—“guilty before God;” and that God “now commandeth all men everywhere to repent;” and that “without faith it is impossible to please God.” Jesus also said, “No man cometh to the Father but by me.” But in the above quotations there is a system of salvation taught which ignores these truths; and, this being the case, it is comparatively a small matter that they have contradicted their much-cherished “principles” to sustain it.*VDRU 21.1*

The same facts which led them to make the above statements, we have also discovered in the Scriptures. We see that the conclusion is unavoidable that there is more than one “order,” or class, in the resurrection. But we never thought necessary to refer a righteous resurrection, or resurrection to eternal life, to “them that know not God,” nor to devise a justification or system of salvation not taught in the Bible. We find a more easy, because a more scriptural, solution in referring it to the “resurrection of the unjust”-of “them that have done evil.” We learn that all now die in Adam without regard to character; but they are on probation, the result of which is life or death. And as they do not now die in view of that probation, as is proved by the fact that they die without any regard to the character formed under that probation, they must be raised to die “the second death,” which is the only death to which their probation relates. This only meets the demands of justice. And this is the teaching of the Bible.*VDRU 21.2*

DOUBLE INFLICTION OF THE PENALTY

Mr. Storrs claims that it would be unjust to inflict the same penalty a second time; and so much stress is laid on this idea that it demands a notice, though the objection really ceases to be of any force when it is shown that all now die by virtue of their relation to Adam, and that our probation is for a life and death beyond the present. Mr. Storrs says:*VDRU 22.1*

"Is a revival into life not a reversal, or abrogation, of the penalty? If abrogated, can it be inflicted a second time without a second trial and sin repeated." *Life from the Dead,* p. 8.*VDRU 22.2*

To this I reply, 1. A revival to life is not a reversal of the penalty; for the penalty has not yet been inflicted. It is only a reversal of the inevitable consequence of Adam's fall, to which consequence our probation does not reach. 2.There is "a second trial and sin repeated," in the case of every individual transgressor; and Mr. Storrs' remarks on the judgment of Adam present that fact in a striking view. He says:*VDRU 22.3*

"Adam stood under a law, in a dispensation peculiar to himself.... It admitted of no repentance or renewed obedience by which the punishment could be remitted; for *one* transgression the transgressor must die. Under that law Adam was placed. He transgressed-his dispensation ended, and God set in judgment on him; arraigned Adam at the judgment-seat-heard the testimony-found him guilty-proceeded solemnly to pronounce the penalty of the law, but saw fit to keep the day of *execution* of the sentence in his own power, and hidden from the knowledge of the criminal; but ultimately he was executed."*VDRU 22.4*

And then he asks:*VDRU 23.1*

"Why is Adam to be made alive, to be judged over again, and die a second time? We discover no Scripture warrant for such an idea." *Id.,* p. 75.*VDRU 23.2*

Now, according to Mr. Storrs' own showing, that dispensation or probation ended with that "one transgression," and judgment set, and sentence was pronounced on the act; but the sentence was not

executed for nearly one thousand years after that judgment. Then, I inquire, was Adam on probation during the many hundred years that he lived after that sentence was pronounced? I think he was; but if so, he was, of course, under a new probation. But if not, then there were over nine hundred years of Adam's life for which he was not held accountable! I cannot discover any warrant, either in Scripture or reason, for his being "made alive to be judged over again," so far as that "one transgression" is concerned for which he was judged, but I do discover an evident reason why he should be judged for the actions of a long life that he lived after that first judgment. And they must admit the conclusion, or deny that Adam had a second [original illegible]*VDRU 23.3*

But such a denial is attended with further difficulty, it being equivalent to a denial that [original illegible] children after him had any probation. For, if [original illegible] be inquired where the probation was introduced under which his children were placed, every on will point to the promise given to Adam that "the seed of the woman" should bruise the serpent' head. Here commenced the gospel system. But it was revealed to Adam, and through him to [original illegible] posterity. And if a new probation was not there introduced to Adam, when and where was it introduced? Will the believers in the non-resurrection theory point to the scripture giving information on this point, that is, if they deny that Adam had another probation granted to him? We find but one revelation of the bringing in of a gospel hope to Adam and his immediate descendants-that in the third chapter of Genesis concerning "the seed" of the woman. But if that was the introduction of a new dispensation, of a probation under which repentance and faith in "the seed" would procure remission, it then follows that Adam had a second trial in this new system. And, of course, for transgressions under this new probation there must be another judgment; and if this transgression was not forgiven, the penalty must be inflicted for this, as well as for the other. Otherwise the penalty of one of these dispensations and judgments will never be executed.*VDRU 24.1*

And now, as Adam died under that transgression without any possibility of remission by repentance or renewed obedience, so do all his posterity-all who share in that "Adamic condition;" no degree of repentance, faith, nor obedience, will avert this death; because

they were not under that dispensation which was “peculiar” to Adam, as Mr. Storrs correctly says. We had no trial of obedience or disobedience in that first judgment, though we fall under its consequences by virtue of our nature-our “Adamic condition.” On this point Mr. Storrs says again:*VDRU 24.2*

“Adam’s posterity were made subject to corruption by being excluded from the tree of life, not as a penal infliction on them,” etc. *Life from the Dead,* p. 11.*VDRU 25.1*

And it is just as true that *they die* for Adam’s sin, as that they were made *subject to corruption* thereby; for exclusion from the tree of life has the same effect on *them* that it had on *him,* to wit: it prevents their living forever. And this, says Mr. Storrs, was “not a penal infliction on them.” True; a penal infliction can only relate to an act under probation; but our probation does not relate to the exclusion from the tree of life, and consequent death; and therefore this death cannot be the penalty of our personal transgressions; but the “second death” is that penalty.*VDRU 25.2*

On this point I will only add: 1. We are never exhorted to repent of Adam’s sin, nor to avert its consequences. Here is where the Pedobaptists err. Infants have no personal sins to be remitted; therefore if they are baptized for the reason given in the gospel, that is, for the remission of sin, it must be Adam’s sin, not their own. But such an idea is never hinted in the Scriptures; it is contrary to the facts and reasons given in the case. Yet according to the non-resurrection views it is the only chance for the salvation of children, Infant-baptismal regeneration and this non-resurrectionism should go together.*VDRU 25.3*

2. Christ is to be the judge of men, for the Father has put all judgment in his hands, and the secrets of men are to be judged by him. And into that judgment “every work” shall be brought, evil as well as good. And it is in view of that judgment that the exhortations are given, and threatenings made, in the Bible. But there is no intimation that Adam’s sin will come into that judgment. The judgment for that is far in the past; with that we, as probationers, have nothing to do.*VDRU 26.1*

“WHAT SAY THE SCRIPTURES?”

Not one of the “principles” that I have yet seen laid down by the advocates of the non-resurrection theory, on which that theory is made to depend, is so evident as to be beyond dispute; on the contrary, I think they are materially defective. Where a dispute arises in regard to principles, by what shall the principles be tested? Most certainly by the plain and positive testimony of Scripture. But in this case another difficulty arises: the most positive expressions of Scripture are also subjects of dispute, each party claiming that the texts which seem to favor their respective views are positive, and that the texts which the opposing parties respectively claim are not positive, but figurative or irrelevant. And therefore the settlement of the whole question, after all, turns upon a correct exposition of the Scriptures, and not, as has been so often claimed, upon the bearing of a few “principles,” so called. *VDRU 26.2*

Entering upon an examination of the Scriptures, I would remark, *VDRU 27.1*

1. It is difficult to show that the texts quoted from the Old Testament to deny the resurrection of the wicked have any reference whatever to the subject of a personal resurrection. But, if it could be shown that they do, it could not yet be proved that they belong to the present time, or that they are not spoken prospectively, in view of a future and utter destruction of the wicked. *VDRU 27.2*

2. The texts claimed as positive in favor of the resurrection of the wicked, speak of the future resurrection as the subject of remark, and specify the wicked as one class to be raised; and therefore they must determine the signification of texts which are not equally explicit and unmistakable in their terms. In all cases the definite must determine the indefinite, otherwise questions of evidence could never be settled. *VDRU 27.3*

3. The texts quoted as proving they shall not see life, are irrelevant, as the context proves that such texts refer to eternal or immortal life, for which we do not contend in behalf of the wicked. For, if they must be taken without being so qualified by their connection, then the connection is left to prove that the wicked do not now live, and

the righteous will not die. And if it be shown that such is the tendency of that claim, the absurdity of the claim will be evident.*VDRU 27.4*

Besides these classes of texts, there are some that speak of the resurrection of the just, but do not speak of the resurrection of the unjust. From these it has been inferred that a resurrection of the unjust is not taught in the Scriptures. But that does not follow. *Entire silence* of the Scriptures on a given subject is overwhelming evidence against it; but the silence of any one text on a certain doctrine is no evidence against it while it is mentioned in another. Otherwise any doctrine could be disproved by merely quoting a sufficient number of texts which make no mention of it, which would be easy to do.*VDRU 28.1*

In examining the Scriptures, I will arrange the texts under certain propositions, to give a better view of my objections to the non-resurrection theory; giving, however, as my first serious objection, that,*VDRU 28.2*

I. *It denies the gospel doctrine of the forgiveness of sin.*VDRU 28.3

This, I think, has been fully proved, and should of itself be sufficient to refute the theory in the minds of all who claim forgiveness in Jesus' name, and recognize the justice of God in justifying the believer. *Romans 3*. That I have not misconstrued the teachings of the Scriptures on this subject, is evident, for Paul says "there is *no condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus." *Romans 8:1*. That I do not misrepresent that theory in saying it denies forgiveness, is evident; for they have the justified pay the *same forfeit to the law* that the unjustified pay. Where there is no condemnation there is innocence; but the innocent cannot justly be required to pay a forfeit to the law. The law requires obedience of them as of others, but it cannot inflict the penalty upon them as it does upon the condemned, without manifest injustice.*VDRU 28.4*

II. *It contradicts all those texts which threaten pain and anguish to the sinner.*VDRU 29.1

I say it contradicts them, because God is just; and that theory places all these texts in opposition to justice. It is asserted that, 1.

Death only is the penalty. 2. Pain or agony is no part of death; therefore, no part of the penalty. 3. To inflict anything outside of, or more than, the penalty, is injustice. The conclusion is evident to all: God would, therefore, be unjust to inflict pain, or agony, or torment, upon the sinner, because these are no part of the "clearly-expressed penalty." If we could find but one text in the Bible clearly expressing the fact that pain or torment would be inflicted, *as an infliction* (not as a mere attendant upon the threatened infliction), then my proposition is true; and that theory stands condemned. *VDRU 29.2*

Revelation 14:10, 11, says that "if *any man* worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup; of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image,! and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." *VDRU 29.3*

The most that can be said to evade the force of this passage is, that the phrase, "forever and ever," is of necessity limited, and does not mean unending duration; and that the passage refers only to a certain class, and not to sinners in general. To which I reply, to the first, It is admitted that the duration expressed is limited; but that does not affect the argument. The proposition requires two things, which are found in the text: 1. A threatening: and, 2. Torment; therefore, the torment is an infliction upon a certain action-it is punishment, or penalty. That it results in death, is admitted; but it is more than "to be dead," it is to *"be tormented."* It is a painful death-the process of dying (which is embraced in the expression, "shall die,") under tormenting circumstances. And whatever limitation is assumed in regard to the time, it is evident that *some time* is required; for torment cannot be inflicted without time; and, in this case, it is "day" and "night." Though the phrase, "forever and ever," is limited, it must convey to every mind the idea of more than a sudden transition from life to a state of death. And to the second, I say that it cannot make any difference whether it refers to *all,* to a *party* or even to a *single individual,* so far as the principle under

consideration is concerned. For if the addition of anguish or torment to death were unjust, as the theory avers, then the justice of God would be compromised by inflicting it upon one man, and certainly by its infliction on a class. It must be evident to the reader that this threat can never be executed, and at the same time God be just and Mr. Storrs' "principles" be correct. To say that God will not be strictly just, were to blaspheme; to say the threat will never be executed, were to deny the word of God. Therefore we must set aside Mr. Storrs' reasoning as a fallacy.*VDRU 30.1*

I say that to deny the infliction of this threat is to deny the word; for we find in *Revelation 16:2*, a prophetic record of its fulfillment. When the "seven last plagues" are poured upon a guilty world, the first is poured upon the very characters against whom the threat is pronounced in *Revelation 14*; *10, 11*, as quoted; "There fell a noisome and *grievous sore* upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and them which worshiped his image." Again, the fourth plague gave the sun power to scorch men with fire; but, that it did not instantly kill them, is evident; for "men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God." And the fifth was poured out on the seat of the beast, "and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they *gnawed their tongues for pain."* It is impossible that these should be considered mere figures of speech, where no real torment or pain is intended; for in these plagues is "filled up the wrath of God." It is much better to "tremble at his word," than to invent theories to neutralize its force.*VDRU 31.1*

But I will now refer to a scripture which exactly agrees with the foregoing, where no figures are used. It is *Romans 2:8, 9*. It reads; "But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, *tribulation* and *anguish."* I am well aware of the effort made to put this tribulation in this life, which will be noticed in its proper place. So far as the proposition now under consideration is concerned, it makes no difference when nor where it is fulfilled. If it is fulfilled at all, and there is pain or anguish in the fulfillment of it, then it stamps the non-resurrection theory of penalty as a fallacy. Our relation to the judgment of God is a most solemn and important matter, and we cannot be too careful how we reason upon it, or to what conclusions we come in regard to it. If our errors do not result disastrously to

ourselves, they may yet prove stumbling-blocks to others, by leading them to presume upon the mercy of God, and to detract from that judgment and justice which is the habitation of his throne. Such, and so dangerous, I think, is the tendency of this non-resurrection theory. *VDRU 32.1*

Other texts of like import might be adduced, but the design is to prove the positions taken, not to try to exhaust the proofs thereon. *VDRU 32.2*

III. *It ignores a "day of judgment" in which actions shall be weighed and punishment awarded.* *VDRU 33.1*

That this proposition is true in regard to that theory, cannot be denied; for, according to that view, every person is fully punished when he is dead. Every day is a day of judgment and execution. That this is not a scriptural view I now offer proof. *VDRU 33.2*

Acts 17:31: "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." *VDRU 33.3*

I am firmly of the belief, in reference to the judgment and destiny of the wicked, that the day of judgment is a definite, appointed time, and succeeds "the day of salvation." Our Saviour made known his mission by reading from the prophet, as recorded in *Luke 4:16-21*: "And he came to Nazareth, where he had been been brought up; and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." By turning to *Isaiah 61*, from which the Saviour read, we find that *verse 3*

reads thus: “To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn.”*VDRU 33.4*

Why did the Saviour stop his reading so abruptly, without reading the sentence following, so closely connected with that which he read? Evidently because no more was that day fulfilled than he read. “The acceptable year of the Lord” was then existing; “the day of vengeance” was a future time, and could not then be proclaimed. So the apostles preached. Paul quoted from another part of Isaiah’s prophecy respecting this time, and added, “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.” *2 Corinthians 6:2*. The accepted time, or acceptable year of the Lord, and day of salvation, are evidently the same. Not a period of definite, or given, length; not a literal day or year; for these terms, as well as “hour” in *Revelation 14:7*, and other places, are used to denote periods without regard to length. The “day of salvation” has now continued over one thousand eight hundred years. Speaking of this day, Paul said it is “now;” but referring to the judgment clay, he said it was a day appointed in the which he will judge-in the future. And so again, in *Acts 24:25*: Felix trembled when Paul reasoned of “judgment to come.” He could not have trembled to hear it announced that he would not be raised from the dead; for he had never believed in a resurrection. And it is hard to believe that he would tremble that Paul should tell him he would die; for he had always known that. Paul must certainly have reasoned of a future judgment-the day of judgment-to make this heathen king tremble.*VDRU 34.1*

In the remarks of those who deny the resurrection of the unjust, on the day of judgment, as well as in their expositions of particular texts, they harmonize with the Universalists. Every day is the execution of judgment to somebody. Besides this, there have been several particular days of judgment. But the Scriptures do not so speak. In *Acts 17:31*, Paul says God has appointed a day in the which he will judge. He says “*a day*,” because there are other *days* beside that; but he, and all other Bible writers, say “THE *day of judgment*,” because there is but one day of that kind. When *“a day”* is appointed for judgment, it then becomes *“the day”*-the only day set apart for that purpose. Let this be borne in mind as we examine the texts.*VDRU 35.1*

The testimony of Peter is so clear and decisive on this point as to leave no room for doubt. He says, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to *reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."* *2 Peter 2:9*. On this Eld. Storrs remarks:*VDRU 35.2*

"We may be sure Peter had reference *only* to the living wicked, who should no more escape the judgment of *death* than the old world or Sodom did. God would reserve, hold, or keep them to that judgment, and they 'shall be brought to the grave and remain in the tomb,' after the 'ensample' Peter spoke of." *Life from the Dead,* p. 69.*VDRU 36.1*

This is not according to the expression of this and other texts, and cannot be the truth concerning these Scriptures. Peter does not merely say they shall be held to judgment, to death, but they shall be reserved "unto *the day* of judgment." The whole question turns on this: whether Peter refers to *indefinite times,* as the day of each man's death, or to *a definite future time,* when all the unjust shall be punished. The latter appears to be true, from the reading of the text, and is shown to be certainly true by *chap. 3* of this same letter; for, fortunately, he has clearly set forth in the latter chapter what he means by the day of judgment. In *chap. 3:7*, he says; "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire, *against the day of judgment* and perdition of ungodly men." Here a fact is stated concerning the heavens and the earth in the very same terms that are used concerning the unjust, in *chap. 2:9*. The earth is reserved unto fire, and the unjust are reserved to be punished, and both alike *unto the day of judgment;* and to make it sure beyond all dispute, the day of judgment, against which the heavens and the earth are reserved unto fire, is also declared to be the day of perdition of ungodly men.*VDRU 36.2*

But again, he not only defines "the day of judgment" to be that day in the which the heavens and the earth shall be dissolved with fire, or melted with fervent heat, but he proceeds to give a reason *why that day is delayed,* which would not be required if Mr. Storrs' view were correct; for, according to that view, there is no delay; that day is every day whenever an unjust man dies! In giving this reason Peter makes "the day of the Lord" to coincide with "the day of

judgment." And the whole is introduced by the subject of the second advent, or rather, these remarks fall under an argument on that subject. This phrase, the day of the Lord, is often used in the prophetic writings, and always in such manner as to show its application to a definite time, immediately subsequent to "the day of salvation." It is used by Paul in *1 Thessalonians 5:2*, in an argument concerning the coming of the Lord. He says, "Of the times and seasons ye have no need that I write unto you, for yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." This proves that the coming of Christ and the coming of the day of the Lord are so closely related that one naturally suggests the other. This, together with the words of Peter, who makes the day of the Lord synonymous with the day of judgment, fixes to a certainty this fact, that *"the* day of judgment" is a definite time-a future day, the day of perdition of ungodly men, not a part of ungodly men, but of every soul that doeth evil, Jew and Gentile.*VDRU 37.1*

The uniform use of the phrase, "the day of the Lord," in both Testaments, proves the correctness of this exposition. A few instances of its use by the prophets, I notice:*VDRU 38.1*

"Thus saith the Lord God: Howl ye, Woe worth the day! For the day is near, even the day of the Lord is near, a cloudy day; it shall be the time of the heathen." *Ezekiel 30:2, 3*.*VDRU 38.2*

"Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come." *Joel 1:15*.*VDRU 38.3*

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." *Chap. 2:1*.*VDRU 38.4*

"And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army; for his camp is very great: for he is strong that executeth his word; for the day of the Lord is great, and very terrible; and who can abide it?" *Verse 11*.*VDRU 38.5*

"Howl ye; for the day of the Lord is at hand; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty." *Isaiah 13:6*.*VDRU 38.6*

"Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord,

and for the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up, and they shall be brought low." *Isaiah 2:10-12*.*VDRU 38.7*

"In that day shall a man cast his idols of silver and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats; to go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth." *Verses 20, 21*.*VDRU 39.1*

This last quotation from the prophet Isaiah is exactly parallel with *Revelation 6:14-17*, which relate to the events of that great day under the opening of the sixth seal. In that day they endeavor to hide "from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the *wrath of the Lamb,"* saying, "For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"*VDRU 39.2*

No one can doubt that the expressions, day of the Lord, day of wrath, day of perdition, and day of judgment, refer to the same period, to which day the unjust are reserved to be punished; and the wicked who prospered in his way in this life, and died in peace and quiet, shall be brought forth to the day of wrath; for every soul of man that doeth evil shall suffer tribulation and anguish, indignation and wrath, in that day.*VDRU 39.3*

If anything can be clearly proved by the Scriptures, it seems to me that this is proved, that the unjust are reserved to be punished, not to the day of the death of each individual, but to the day in which the heavens and earth shall melt with fervent heat, which is *the day* of the Lord, the *day* of judgment, *the day* of perdition of ungodly men.*VDRU 39.4*

And now, inasmuch as the apostles spoke by the same Spirit which was conferred upon them by the Lord Jesus, and which is also called the Spirit of Christ, when they spoke of "the day of judgment," they must have meant exactly what he meant when he spoke of "the day of judgment." And here let it be remarked, that this is not

an arbitrary condition by which a forced construction is put upon his language to make it harmonize with that of the apostles, but, to the contrary, his language perfectly agrees with theirs, and must be forced to make it refer to something beside that which by them is defined to be "*the day* of judgment." Thus in *Matthew 10:15*, referring to the city which should reject him, he said, "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city." Also in *chapter 11:23, 24*, he upbraids Capernaum, with threatening, and says, "It shall be more tolerable for Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." On this text, Eld. Storrs remarks:*VDRU 40.1*

"Now observe, the day of judgment here spoken of is the day of Capernaum's visitation for its disregard of Jesus' works. Sodom was judged, overthrown, and did *not* "remain until this day' in which Christ spoke; therefore judgment had been executed upon that city. Now what? The day of Capernaum's judgment was at hand, and it should be more intolerable than the infliction on Sodom." *Life from the Dead,* p. 56.*VDRU 40.2*

Now look at the text, and the facts in the case, and judge whether such remarks are just. Is it a fact that any judgment yet inflicted on Capernaum was more intolerable than that inflicted on Sodom? What special visitation came upon her, exceeding that which came upon Sodom? None. Her, inhabitants died as other generations had; and the city itself passed away as many others had before, and have since. Evidently the Saviour's prediction remains to be fulfilled.*VDRU 41.1*

But again, the Saviour does not say it shall be more intolerable for Capernaum in the day of her judgment than it was for Sodom in the day of hers. This is the construction put upon the text in the extract quoted. But the words of Jesus throw Sodom forward into the judgment, thus: "*It shall be* more tolerable for Sodom *in the day* of judgment." *The day of judgment* is never used in the Scriptures but in such manner as to indicate exactly what Peter affirms it to be, viz., the future day of retribution. We must allow the words of Christ and his apostles to harmonize, for so they do in fact; and the natural construction of the Saviour's language does place *the* day of judgment in the future, as do the words of the apostles, and also

brings Sodom into that day.*VDRU 41.2*

Another consideration is here involved, which should not be lost sight of. If the day of judgment for that generation is in the past, and that infliction was their final punishment it follows that inasmuch as Lot was delivered from the terrors of that day, he has had his final deliverance. For on what principle is Lot made a subject of *two judgments* more than the other men of his age? But if it be affirmed that there is a future, final deliverance for Lot, as all will affirm, can that fact be more clearly proved by the Scriptures than can the relative fact that the wicked are "reserved" to the day of judgment to be punished? The events of that day were either final, or they were not. If they were final, then Lot has had his reward; if they were not, then our opponents are wrong in their theory and conclusions. And so of Noah, and of all others who have escaped what we denominate *temporal* or *special* judgments. If the judgments from which they were delivered were not temporal or special, but final, as our opponents affirm, then Noah, Lot, etc, have had deliverance *from the final judgments of their respective ages,* and therefore cannot look for a deliverance in the future, not pertaining to the judgments assigned to their ages. This conclusion is unavoidable, and I see no possible way for the opposers of the resurrection of the wicked to escape its consequences.*VDRU 41.3*

Emphatic and decisive as are the words of Peter in his second letter, they are not more so than are the words of Paul in *Romans 2*. He speaks of those who despise the riches of God's grace, and who refuse to repent, as treasuring to themselves "wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." *Verse 5*. The expositions of this scripture by the opponents of the resurrection of the wicked, are but a rehash of the well-known comments of Universalists. There are several points in the apostle's argument to be noticed:*VDRU 42.1*

1. The day of wrath and judgment.*VDRU 43.1*

2. Every soul of man is subjected to this judgment.*VDRU 43.2*

3. Mankind are divided into two classes, each having an interest in the events of that day.*VDRU 43.3*

a. Seekers for immortality, who work righteousness, who will have glory, honor, peace, and eternal life. *Verses 7, 10*.*VDRU 43.4*

b. The contentious and disobedient, who will be subjected to indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, *verses 8, 9*, whose destiny is specially referred to that day. *Verse 5*.*VDRU 43.5*

But here it is objected that, as this tribulation and wrath is "to the Jew first," it is thereby proved to be a *national* infliction and has already been fulfilled, as wrath has come "to the uttermost" upon them. *Life from the Dead,* p. 71. Now as regards *1 Thessalonians 2:16*, it certainly cannot mean that "every soul" of the Jewish nation had already suffered the wrath of God to the uttermost; and if it does not, it is not properly referred to in the above objection. Jerusalem was not overthrown by the Romans until sixteen years after this writing; therefore Paul must certainly mean that by their actions, as described, they had rendered themselves subject or liable to this wrath. The infliction of wrath to the uttermost is the utter destruction of the subject of it, as the Scriptures abundantly prove. But every soul of the Jewish nation was not then destroyed. How then can the above comment be correct? And the letter to the Romans was written several years later than the first to the Thessalonians. Yet in *Romans 2*, he invariably speaks of the future.*VDRU 43.6*

But there is another serious difficulty in the way of Eld. Storrs' exposition of this text, wherein he endeavors to prove by *verse 9* that wrath or judgment comes not in one particular day or time, but to the "Jew first;" that their judgment is in the past. Look then at the contrast. Glory, honor, peace, immortality, eternal life, to "every man that worketh good, *to the Jew first,* and also to the Gentile." *Verses 7, 10*. Does this prove that the faithful Jews will be immortalized and glorified before the Gentiles? It must mean that if their theory and exposition are correct. But on the authority of other definite Scripture statements we may safely say that is not the idea of the apostle. All the dead saints will be raised at once; all the living saints will be changed at once, and all be caught up together to meet the Lord. In all this argument the Jews are shown to have had a pre-eminence in the promises and privileges of God's gracious purposes. See *chap. 3:1, 2*; *9:1-5*; etc. And of course

where greater privileges are given, greater responsibilities rest, and they would stand first in rank to meet the reward of their disobedience. This is, evidently, the idea of this scripture.*VDRU 44.1*

And yet a further objection is urged that it no more follows that, because "every soul of man" is to be brought into this judgment, therefore past generations have to be raised to be subjected to it, than because the gospel was to be preached to "every creature," it is necessary that the dead should be raised to hear it. *Life from the Dead,* pp. 70, 71. This, and some other statements, I can but read with regret. (1) All confess that God has the ability to raise the dead for purposes of judgment if he sees fit. (2) All confess that *some* are raised to receive their reward, according to *Romans 2*, for immortality and eternal life cannot be conferred on every one that has sought for them, unless they have a resurrection. (3) The preaching of the gospel is preparatory to the judgment, but does not run *into that day;* therefore the statements are by no means parallel in their bearing. And, (4) In all these respects there is a vast and acknowledged difference between the acts of judgment on the part of God and the preaching of the gospel by finite, mortal man. Our duties to our fellow-probationers can only relate to the course of our natural lives; God's dispensations and judgments have no such bounds set to them. Such statements as that referred to above, are n o t *arguments,* and we leave them, to further consider the text.*VDRU 45.1*

All the facts brought to view in *Romans 2*, prove that the apostle therein uses the expressions "day of wrath" and "judgment," in the same sense that he has used them in other places, and that the other apostles and the Saviour used them. "Every soul of man" is a very comprehensive expression; Jews and Gentiles are both included in it-not by implication, but-by direct and express statement. Both are referred to in *verses 11-15*, and *verse 16* is directly related thereto. This speaks of "the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." Not of one generation of men-but *of men;* all to whom he has previously referred in the same argument; every soul of man, both Jews and Gentiles; and here I note another point in the argument.*VDRU 45.2*

4. Jesus Christ will be judge in that day. This is strongly confirmatory of the view that this is a future judgment-a day appointed in the which he will judge, as in *Acts 17:31*, when he who is now the Advocate will take judgment into his hands. The Saviour himself, in *John 5:26-29*, closely connected his "authority to execute judgment" with the resurrection of evil-doers. Woe to the soul that is unreconciled to God in that day, when "the wrath of the Lamb" is manifested-the wrath of that Lamb of God that has long been pleading the merits of his own blood in behalf of the very ones on whom he will take vengeance in the day of wrath. *VDRU 46.1*

These statements of the Saviour and his apostles give us a clear understanding of *Job 21:30*, concerning which there has been much needless dispute. Eld. Curry, in his discussion with Eld. Grant, after criticising this text gave the following rendering: "The wicked is kept in the day of calamity, and brought on with funeral pomp in the day of death." This rendering is certainly forbidden both by the context and by the harmony of the Scriptures. *Verses 19 and 20* say, "God layeth up his iniquity for his children; he rewardeth him, and he shall know it; his eyes shall see his destruction, and he shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty." That this does not refer to the event of natural death, is evident from *verse 23*: "One dieth in his full strength, being wholly at ease and quiet." "Tribulation and anguish" have not yet been his portion. But they shall be, in that "the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction; they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath." This agrees with Peter, who says the unjust are reserved to the day of judgment to be punished; and he further says that that day of judgment is that day in the which the heavens and earth shall be melted by fire. "And they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath." Paul shows that this day of wrath is the day of judgment, in which Jesus Christ shall judge the secrets of men-even every soul of man that doeth evil, Jew and Gentile. Brought forth from whence? Not brought forth to burial; but they who die at ease, and in peace, and in full strength, are brought forth to the day of wrath, and to that day they are "reserved," and Peter says "to be punished." Of course they are brought forth from the grave-from death; for this is the statement of *Job 1*. He dies in ease and quiet. 2. He is reserved to the day of destruction. 3. He shall be brought forth to the day of wrath. And that day is a definite, appointed day, clearly marked in the Scriptures. *VDRU 46.2*

Job 21 is, beyond all contradiction, describing the awful destiny of the wicked-the wrath that awaits him. But what is his terrible destiny, according to the criticism and rendering of the opposer of the resurrection of evil-doers? It is this: He shall be kept in the day of calamity, die in ease and quiet, and at last have a splendid funeral! The subject is altogether too solemn and important to admit of criticisms and "renderings" which are a mere burlesque of the threatenings of God's wrath upon evil-doers. *VDRU 48.1*

The same idea presented by Job is again brought to view in *Isaiah 24:21, 22*: "And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered together in the pit; and shall be shut up in the prison; and after many days they shall be visited." Peter speaks also of the "spirits in prison," to whom the Lord by his Spirit preached in the days of Noah. They were not in prison in Noah's day, in the time when they were preached unto; but they are now in prison. This determines what Isaiah meant by the prison in which they shall be shut up "many days;" there they await the day of wrath, when they shall be visited, brought forth to be punished. *VDRU 48.2*

Our examination thus far aids us in determining (if any such aid is needed) the meaning of *Jude 14, 15*. The Lord, when ho comes to execute judgment, will convince all of their ungodly deeds, and of all their hard speeches which they have spoken against him. This will be fulfilled when he judges the secrets of men—"of every soul of man." To convince *all* the ungodly of their ungodly deeds and words, they must be in a state or condition to be convinced, which they will be when they are brought forth from their prison to the day of wrath. *VDRU 48.3*

But another fact is stated by Jude which has a most important bearing on this question. He affirms that "the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath *reserved* in everlasting chains under darkness, *unto the judgment of the great day." Verse 6*. This language is unmistakable in its import, and cannot possibly be evaded, or made to refer to anything but a future judgment. Peter said, "God spared not the angels that sinned, but

cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be *reserved unto judgment."* 2 Peter 2:4. They were not spared-they were cast down; but they are reserved unto judgment, *the judgment of the great day.* This is "*the* day of judgment" unto which the unjust are reserved to be punished. The day is the same; there is but one great day of wrath or judgment; and the terms used are the same concerning the fallen angels and unjust men. Both are *reserved* to be punished in that day. To that day and its events Paul refers in 1 Corinthians 6:2, 3: "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" And this judgment is contrasted with judgments pertaining to "this life," showing it to be that future and eternal judgment unto which both the angels and unjust men are reserved. Paul says we shall judge "the world;" that is, the world of the ungodly. Not a particular class of the world, but *the world,* and as this is not in "this life," it must be beyond the judgment and resurrection or translation of the saints, who are raised or translated one thousand years before the resurrection of the unjust. It is impossible to show that any one part or generation of "the world" have a special or exclusive interest in "the judgment of the great day;" while every scripture evidence show's that all classes and ages of the unjust, both of men and angels, are reserved unto the day of judgment-the great day-to be punished. VDRU 49.1

Much more might be produced on this point, but I do not deem it necessary. Enough evidence has been given from the word of God, it seems to me, to convince every one of the fallacy of the expositions and conclusions of those who, to avoid the truth of the resurrection of the wicked, endeavor also to disprove a general judgment. I leave it, to examine another point. VDRU 50.1

IV. *It contradicts the plain teaching of the Bible in regard to the resurrection of the unjust.* VDRU 50.2

First, I appeal to the words of the Saviour in John 5:28, 29. "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." In the verse preceding, he said the Father had "given him authority to execute judgment," and we have already

seen when the judgment will be executed,-in that great day of wrath unto which the unjust are now “reserved,” and unto which they are eventually to be “brought forth.” Every attempt to avoid the force of this plain, positive testimony of the Son of God, so far as I have seen, is only an evasion. It is contended that the prophets declare they shall not rise, and of course the Saviour does not contradict them, so he cannot mean what we claim on his language. Suppose we turn it in this manner. The prophets testified of Christ, who came into the world to bear witness to the truth; and of course they could not contradict his testimony; and therefore, inasmuch as he says the unjust shall come forth from the graves to a resurrection, any construction of their language which would make *them* contradict *him* is inadmissible. And two important considerations sustain me in this position. 1. It is a just principle of criticism that the words of the prophets are to be explained by the declarations of the New Testament, for, in many respects, the New Testament is a commentary on the Old 2. There is not so clear evidence in the prophets against the resurrection of the unjust as there is in the New Testament in its favor. The strength of evidence lies on this side of the question. The truth of this statement will be seen, I trust, when we carefully examine the texts. *VDRU 50.3*

In the Saviour’s words in *John 5:28, 29*, we notice: 1. There can be no reasonable dispute in regard to the nature of the resurrection in this passage, as it is introduced by his authority to execute judgment. 2. Before he divides them into two classes he speaks of them collectively as being in one place, thus, “all that are in the graves.” 3. He affirms of them all alike that they “shall come forth.” 4. The words immediately following explain that this coming forth is the resurrection; that is, they shall come forth from the graves. The same expression the Saviour used when he raised Lazarus from the dead. *Chap 11:43*. 5. Having fixed the fact that they shall all, come forth from the graves, he next divides them that come forth into two classes. 6. He says that they that have done good [shall come forth] unto the resurrection of life. That this is a literal, actual resurrection, cannot, with any show of reason, be denied; for if the coming forth from the graves to the resurrection of life, is not the literal resurrection of the just, what can it mean? or what language can describe that event? 7. He also says they that have done evil [shall come forth] unto the resurrection of damnation. The statement

concerning the evil-doers, is identical with that concerning the well-doers, except as to the object of their respective resurrections. Both classes are in the graves; both come forth from the graves; both have a resurrection. I pity the person who attempts to array the Scriptures against these words of the Son of God.*VDRU 52.1*

But plain as are these words, there are objections urged against them. These I must notice.*VDRU 53.1*

It is objected that the term resurrection has sometimes a figurative meaning, and therefore this resurrection of evil-doers is not a literal resurrection. We admit that the term is sometimes used figuratively, and so are most all other words. “Life” and “rise” are also used figuratively; why may we not apply their remark to their proof texts, and so remove their objection to the Saviour’s words? Surely the word is not always used figuratively, and if I were left to select a text where it is *not* so used, *John 5:29* would be that one. The objection is an unreasonable one. If this text does not refer to a literal resurrection of the saints, how shall that doctrine be proved? But the same facts are predicated of both classes. They are all in the graves. Does this mean that the righteous are in literal graves, and the wicked in figurative graves? And they shall all come forth. Can this mean that a part come forth literally, and a part figuratively? Such interpretations are no less than trifling with the plainest declarations of the Scriptures. Prove that this means a figurative resurrection and you easily prove that there is no literal resurrection taught in the New Testament.*VDRU 53.2*

In proof that it is a figurative resurrection, reference is made to *Ezekiel 37*, the vision of the valley of bones, which, it is said, is a figurative resurrection. But this claim I deny. That the vision itself embraces figures, I admit. But the Lord gave an *explanation* of the vision; if the explanation is also figurative, it amounts to no explanation at all, as another explanation of *its* figures would be necessary to an understanding of it. See the parable of the wheat and tares in *Matthew 13*. The parable itself is in figurative language, but the Saviour’s explanation is in literal terms, otherwise it is do explanation When the Lord explained the vision to Ezekiel he said; “These dry bones are [represent in figure] the whole house of Israel.” Is the “house of Israel” a figure of speech? If so, what does

it represent? Away with such pretended expositions of the word of God. But what shall take place as represented by the vision? "Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." Will the promise to Abraham ever be fulfilled that he shall possess that land? See *Acts 7:4, 5*. It will. How? Just as is here promised to all the Israel of God, by opening his grave, and bringing him up out of his grave. They who make the Lord's words in *Ezekiel 37:11-14*, figurative, destroy all of God's promises to Israel. *VDRU 53.3*

It is again objected that *Ezekiel 37* proves that it is not necessary that the wicked shall be made alive to fulfill these scriptures, as the dry bones heard and were moved before there was any life in them. That was in the vision; but how is it in the actual resurrection? Do they come forth from the graves dead? Yes, replies the objector, *Revelation 20* says the dead stand before God. What will men not do to sustain a theory! Listen to the words of Jesus: "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up." The deaf heard, not in their deafness, but by being cured thereof. The lame walked when their lameness was removed; and the dead were no longer dead when they were raised up. Yet it plainly says, "The deaf hear," "the lame walk," and "the dead are raised up." Let our Saviour's words explain *Revelation 20*, and there is no difficulty. And again, this criticism is shown to be invalid by *1 Corinthians 15:15*, etc.: "Whom he raised not up, if so be that *the dead* rise not." Do "the dead" rise up as dead bodies? "How are *the dead* raised up?" This shows what the Scriptures mean by the dead being raised up. Why force a construction on *Revelation 20* which they know is not justified by common sense, nor admissible in any other part of the Bible? There will be no necessity for making the Bible teach absurdities if we keep absurd theories out of its way. But when these plain statements of Christ are referred to, we are met, as a last resort, with the declaration that "established principles" do not admit of such a construction of his language as we claim. If any are yet shaken by this declaration, I invite them to turn back, and read again the examination of the so-called "principles" laid down by that class of expositors, and then say if there is any necessity for turning aside the plain testimony of the Lord, or making it teach that which

in its obvious import it never can teach.*VDRU 54.1*

I next appeal to the words of Paul, in *Acts 24:15*: "And have hope toward God which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."*VDRU 56.1*

On this text it may be well first to say, that the translation is as correct as may be; a better rendering, probably, could not be given. Some versions reject the words, "of the dead;" there is some doubt of their genuineness; but Greenfield, following Griesbach, says there is not sufficient evidence to justify their removal from the text. This is not material, as no doubt has ever been raised as to the subject of the remark; all admit, so far as I know, that the subject is the resurrection of the dead.*VDRU 56.2*

This text is an exceedingly difficult one for the opposers of the resurrection of the wicked. Eld. Storrs says, "This text would have great weight on the question if there were no opposing considerations." Whether the "opposing considerations" are sufficient to counteract the weight of the text, let the reader judge. In favor of the doctrine taught by the text, I have nothing to say. Words cannot add to the force of the passage, as it is so plain that it does not admit of explanation. In this respect it is just such a text as I always love to resort to as a proof text: it needs no labor to make it prove what it is quoted to prove. But a great deal of labor has been spent to destroy its testimony in favor of the resurrection of the unjust.*VDRU 56.3*

It is claimed that, as Paul is herein laying down the object of his *hope,* he cannot mean to say that the unjust will be raised, as that cannot be an object of hope. It is quite gratuitous to speculate on what Paul *meant* to say, while we have in plain terms what he *did say!* Greenfield gives the definition *expect,* as well as *hope,* to the original; but that rendering is not necessary; I accept it as it stands. The hope of the resurrection of the dead is a legitimate hope, and it necessarily includes two parties. The hope of the coming of Christ is a legitimate hope, because it is based on positive revelation; yet the reward of the righteous is no more certain to rest upon that coming than it is certain that the terrible destiny of the wicked is suspended on his coming. The hope of his coming necessarily

embraces all the concomitants of his coming, and all these are alike subjects of prophetic promise. In regard to the word *hope,* there is no more incongruity in Paul's words in *Acts 24:15*, than in Peter's words in *2 Peter 3:7-9*, where he bases the expectation of the melting of the earth and perdition of ungodly men on the *promise* of God. Let our opponents on Paul's words note this text; it will be difficult for them to apply their rule of exposition to Peter's prophecy. But if they feel compelled to free the words of revelation from such appearance of incongruity, let them try their hand on *Psalm 136:10, 15*: "To Him that smote Egypt in their first-born; for his mercy endureth forever." "But overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea; *for his mercy endureth forever:"* They might do by this as they do by *Acts 24:15*: deny that it means so, because there was no mercy in the transaction. But there was mercy to *somebody* involved, if not to Pharaoh and his host; and so of *Acts 24*; somebody's hope rests on these facts. But whether it be denied or distorted, there it stands, a decisive declaration of the resurrection of the unjust.*VDRU 57.1*

A very weak point is made by the advocates of that theory, of which I am reminded by their comments on Paul's hope. Thus it is said, "If the love of God can raise the wicked to punish them, then only may they be raised; for God is love." Very good for Universalists, but defective in point of fact. Suppose we say, If the love of God will destroy the wicked, then may they be destroyed, but not otherwise. And this is apposite; for Jesus, who raises the dead, likewise takes vengeance. *2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8*; *Revelation 6:16, 17*. If judgment destinies were to be decided by love alone, the revelation which God has made to us would be far different from what it now is. Justice is the ruling attribute in that transaction, for the offer of mercy to the incorrigible is entirely withdrawn before the judgment is executed; and he who loses sight of this fact is poorly qualified to reason on the nature and events of that day.*VDRU 58.1*

Another objection, supposed to be insurmountable, is urged as follows; In announcing his hope, Paul said he believed all things which are written in the law and the prophets; but the prophets never said the wicked should be raised; therefore this was no part of his belief. A specious argument, truly, to avoid the force of a positive declaration! I have two objections to urge against this

assertion: *VDRU 59.1*

(1) Those who claim as above are not always safe guides in regard to what the prophets teach. Probably not one of them would ever have known that Abraham had the resurrection taught to him, had not Paul affirmed it. *Hebrews 11:17-19*. Perhaps this reference is the first of the idea to some of them. Nor would they have known that Jehovah's words to Moses prove a resurrection of the dead, had not Jesus so explained them. *Luke 20:37, 88*. Which of them, by reading *Isaiah 7:10-16*, would ever have thought of applying this prophecy to the birth of Christ, had not Matthew so applied it. *Matthew 1:23*. And so I might quote a score of texts, for the application of which we are entirely dependent on the comments of New-Testament speakers and writers. In the light of these facts, it seems nothing short of arrogance to rise up against the plain statement of the apostle with a counter statement, in a matter wherein, from the very nature of the case, their testimony is not admissible against him. *VDRU 59.2*

But (2) I affirm that the prophets do teach the resurrection of the wicked. Every text which has been, or might be, quoted to prove a future judgment of the wicked, is proof of their resurrection. Such texts are not scarce. But there is one at least which plainly and positively teaches the resurrection of the unjust. I refer to *Daniel 12:2*. I am not ignorant of the efforts made to destroy the force of this plain declaration. I should be very much surprised that men of learning have given such a criticism as to destroy the meaning of this text, were I not aware of the fact that learning is no safeguard against error. Prof. Bush was the first to start on this side-track, and quite consistently ended the course by entirely denying the literal resurrection of the dead. For here is where consistency requires us to go if we deny the resurrection of the wicked; for if such plain, positive statements as are found in *John 5:28, 29*; *Acts 24:15*, and others, can be spiritualized away, then every text supposed to teach the resurrection of the dead may be likewise easily set aside. *VDRU 60.1*

That two classes are brought to view in *Daniel 12:2*, will not be denied. It is also admitted that there are two elliptical clauses in the text. Granting that the words rendered "some" should be rendered

"these" and "those" (of which, however, I am not satisfied), the text will only be read correctly when the ellipses are properly supplied. They who deny the resurrection of the wicked read it thus: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, these *the awakened* to everlasting life, and those *the unawakened* to shame and everlasting contempt." The *italic* words in this reading point out where the ellipses are to be supplied. But the reading is altogether defective. In supplying an ellipsis, no new member should be introduced in the sentence; that only should be supplied, the omission of which prevents tautology. In the reading quoted above, the ellipsis is supplied in neither case; but a *comment* or *note of explanation* inserted instead. This is not admissible. It will be seen that the sentences are precisely alike in construction, thus: "These----to everlasting life; and those---to shame and everlasting contempt." "These" and "those" refer to the individuals comprising the "many" that "awake;" and these individuals are not classified or separated into parties *before* these sentences are introduced, but are spoken of collectively. Hence, both sentences refer back to "shall awake," as their predicate, [understood.] Each sentence *must* have at least two elements, the *subject,* or nominative, and the *predicate,* or verb. "These *the awakened* to everlasting life," is not a complete sentence; "those *the unawakened* to shame," is open to the same objection. "Shall awake" is the only predicate relating to "life" and to "shame," respectively, as shown by the preposition. The omission of this in each case prevents tautology; and its insertion does not introduce any new member in the sentence. Therefore this is the proper rendering of the text: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; these *shall awake* to everlasting life; and those *shall awake* to shame and everlasting contempt." And I contend that no other words can be inserted without perverting the text. Submitting this criticism to an accomplished teacher, he remarked that the only difficulty that the case presented was to prove a thing which was so evidently true. And this passage affords the most positive evidence of a resurrection of two classes, having entirely different destinies beyond the resurrection. If Paul believed all that was "written in the prophets," he must have believed in the resurrection of the unjust. And this was his confession of faith. *VDRU 60.2*

Eld. Storrs, noticing the translation of "these" and "those," by Bush

and Whiting, says:*VDRU 62.1*

"Such being the facts, no argument in favor of the wicked dead being made alive again can be strengthened by using this text; for when translated according to Whiting and Bush, it is against the wicked's living from the dead." *Life from the Dead,* p. 39.*VDRU 62.2*

I have used the translation of Whiting and Bush, and I confidently appeal to the reader if it alters the sense of the passage so as, by any fair grammatical construction, to contradict the rising or awaking of the wicked. Bush, in his comment, says those refers to the unawakened; but a *comment* and a *translation* are quite different things. I have allowed the translation, though I do not think it beyond dispute. The same words—*ailleh* and *weailleh*—are translated "some" in other texts, and apparently correctly, as in *Joshua 8:22*, "some," "and some." And in truth they are the same word, the "we" being a prefix *generally* answering to the conjunction "and;" and it assuredly does answer to that word in the text in question. And so the LXX have rendered it in different places. Take, for instance, *Psalm 20:7*. "Some [Heb. *ailleh*—Gr. *outoi*] trust in chariots, *and some* [Heb. *weailleh*—Gr. *kai outoi*] in horses." And so in *Daniel 12:2*, both in Hebrew and Greek. Granting that "these" is generally a better rendering of *ailleh* and *outoi* than "some," there yet appears no necessity for a change of the word by the presence of the conjunction. In any possible view, I cannot see that the inference drawn from this passage by those who deny the resurrection of the unjust has any foundation whatever. I think the remark of Eld. Storrs is very unguarded, to say the least, and calculated to give the impression that a correct translation of the text makes it oppose the rising of the wicked, which is not the case.*VDRU 62.3*

I have seen a change of translation of *Daniel 12:2*, which is far more plausible than that produced by the opposers of the resurrection of the wicked. It is the substitution of the word *multitude* for *many.* "The multitude of them sleeping in the dust of the earth shall awake." I do not assert positively that it is correct, though the word there used is sometimes rendered multitude, in the Old Testament.*VDRU 63.1*

1 Corinthians 15:22, is another passage which, in my mind, clearly teaches the resurrection of the unjust: “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” They are made alive in, or by, Christ; not, as some say, “all *in Christ*” are made alive, but in Christ shall *all* be made alive. If this be not so, I cannot imagine what *verse 23* can mean: “But every man in his own order.” For if the righteous only are made alive there is but one order. And here I am obliged to say I must dissent in some respects from the expositions of this text that are generally given by those who affirm the resurrection of the wicked. It is usually admitted that there are *three orders* in the text: 1. Christ; 2. His at his coming; 3. The rest of the dead, or the wicked. This is evidently an error, and also gives the whole ground, on that verse to the opposition; for, in allowing that Christ is one order, *verse 23* becomes explainable without any reference to the wicked, there being two orders without them. But it will be noticed that the resurrection of Christ is made the basis of the argument for the resurrection of man, and it is in, or by, Christ that “all shall be made alive.” When it says, “Every man in his own order,” it refers to every man of them who are made alive in Christ, and to no others. And to make Christ one order in this list we must make his resurrection the basis of his resurrection; that is to say, Christ is included in the number who are made alive in Christ! but this is absurd.*VDRU 64.1*

Some authors, whose research and learning entitle their opinion to consideration, apply the word translated end *(telos)* to the *rest,* or *last part* of the resurrected ones. On this, expositors are not agreed. Whether this be so or not, makes but little difference so far as this argument is concerned. The resurrection of the wicked is found in this passage in these expressions, “All be made alive,” and, “Every man in his own order.” To make sense of this it must be allowed that there is more than one order. And it is no detriment to this view that the argument in the latter part of the chapter is concerning them that are Christ’s exclusively; as it is no uncommon thing to first state a great truth and then take up an argument upon a certain branch of that truth. And that this is a correct view of this text is proved by those scriptures which state in positive terms that there is more than one order of the resurrection, to wit, one of the just, and one of the unjust; one of them that have done good, and one of them that have done evil; one to everlasting life, the other to shame

and condemnation.*VDRU 64.2*

They further endeavor to sustain the claim they make on *verse 22* by an argument on the word "perish," in *verse 18*, thus: If Christ were not raised there would be no resurrection, and all would perish; but it is taught in the Scriptures that they who reject Christ will yet perish; and the meaning of the word perish is illustrated by the fact that all would perish if there were no resurrection; and therefore they that perish will not have a resurrection.*VDRU 65.1*

This is an argument presented by them with a great deal of confidence, but I consider it a very feeble one. The word is not changed in signification though they might perish under certain circumstances without a resurrection, and under other circumstances after a resurrection. The wages of sin is death; granted that the wicked will be raised to be punished for their personal sins, and die a second time, that would not in the least change the meaning of the word death.*VDRU 66.1*

But the great fault of this argument, and which is, indeed, the great fault underlying that whole system, is that it leaves out of sight the whole subject of personal probation and its consequences. It is admitted that if Christ had not come at all there would have been no resurrection, nor would there have been any probation for any of Adam's posterity. They would all have died exactly as they all die now, *and exactly for the same reason*, but no resurrection would have been admissible as there would have been no probation, and, of course, no personal responsibility; no further reward could have reached them. It is for this cause that Paul makes the future judgment rest on the resurrection of Christ. *Acts 17:31*. The promise of a Saviour placed Adam and all his posterity under a new probation, and this and its consequent penalty must be taken into account in determining the reason for the perishing of any thereafter. So the argument on the word perish is worthless because it loses sight of the responsibility attaching to our personal actions.*VDRU 66.2*

This statement of the error of that argument was publicly met by an esteemed brother of that faith with the following illustration: A boat upset, and the men were in danger of drowning; why? because the

boat upset. But another boat put out from the shore to rescue them. Then if they refused to get into that boat, and were drowned, for what would we say they were then drowned? because they refused to get into the boat that came to their rescue. They drowned all the same; but being brought into relation to a new order of circumstances, their death is attributed to the neglect or rejection of these new privileges.*VDRU 67.1*

This illustration is as good as anything that could be presented to sustain that view. But as it regards meeting the point, it amounts to just nothing at all. Let us carry it a little further and see. Suppose part of the company had accepted the offered assistance and yet drowned with the others; for what would you say they then drowned? You cannot say they drowned because they refused the proffered aid, for they accepted it. You cannot say they drowned because the first boat upset, for that will destroy all the force of your illustration, which is designed to remove the drowning from its original cause. The illustration does not meet nor remove the difficulty; nor can it be removed. The gospel is the life-boat to save from drowning, or death; but whether or not we accept it we all alike die; and therefore the conclusion is unavoidable that if it accomplishes its object, it saves from a death beyond the present one-the second death. To this the Lord evidently refers in his declaration and appeal. In his declaration that if a man die *in* his sins he also shall die *for* his sins; *Ezekiel 18:26*; in his appeal to them, thus: “Turn ye, for why will ye die?” *Ezekiel 33:11*. If there shall be but one death, seeing that all must die that, the answer to the above question or appeal is easily given, thus-*because they cannot help it;* they have been subjected to the necessity of dying, and there is no way to escape from that necessity.*VDRU 67.2*

Revelation 1:7 says, “Behold, He cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they which pierced him.” I do not know of any construction of this text which makes its fulfillment possible without a resurrection of them that pierced him. Other scriptures which speak of “all” in such relation are evaded with the declaration that they only refer to all then living. But this text clearly points to his crucifiers, who shall see him at a future time, and of course must have a resurrection.*VDRU 68.1*

Another positive testimony on the resurrection of the unjust is found in *Revelation 20*; not in a single verse only, but in the harmony of the entire chapter. The first evidence is found in *verse 5*. After stating that they who had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, lived and reigned, it says: “But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished.” This is equivalent to a direct statement that they shall live again after the thousand years are finished. *VDRU 68.2*

Again, it is said of the re-living of the righteous: “This is the first resurrection.” This implies that there will be a second resurrection; and, taken in connection with the previous statement and others in the chapter, it amounts to a certain affirmation that there will be a second resurrection. *VDRU 69.1*

Again, it not only speaks of a first resurrection, and of the rest of the dead who do not live again until after a certain period, but also of “the second death” that has no power over those who are raised in the first resurrection; therefore, there will be a second death which will have power on them who have their part in the second resurrection. And this is confirmed by *verses 14 and 15*: “Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.” This is declared to be the second death. And also by *chap. 2:11*: “He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.” Three points are proved by this text. 1. There will be a second death. 2. Some will be subject to its power. 3. They will be *hurt* of it. And thus it appears that if we set aside *Revelation 20*, on the subject of the second death, we must set aside *chap. 2*, also. *VDRU 69.2*

And again, “*death* and *hades* delivered up the dead which were in them;” “and whosoever”—of whom? Of them that were delivered up of death and hades—“was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.” This is the second death. But it is objected, if death delivered up all the dead, there was then no dead. This has only a degree of technical plausibility; in fact, there is no reason in it. Death is not destroyed while there is a sinner in existence; for the wages of sin is death, and while a sinner exists, death is ever ready to claim its own. But, on the other hand, it is a fact that when death delivers up the dead which are in it, they are

not thenceforth dead until death receives them again. Death cannot deliver them up and they still remain dead. But when death receives them again in the lake of fire, which is to them the second death, then it is said that death and hades are also cast therein. For, from that time onward, even to eternity, there are no more subjects for death to prey upon. The work of death ends with the utter destruction of the wicked in the lake of fire.*VDRU 69.3*

Now in regard to the objection that this is the only scripture that speaks of the second death, I remark that one plain declaration of Scripture is sufficient for those that "tremble at the word;" and this is in perfect harmony with the general tenor of the Scriptures, which largely bring to view a future judgment of "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, to every soul of man that doeth evil;" also there are numerous texts which plainly speak of the same things revealed in *Revelation 20*. A few I will notice.*VDRU 70.1*

John the Baptist compared the wicked to chaff, and said they should be burned up with unquenchable fire. *Revelation 20* confirms this statement, and gives the time and order of the event.*VDRU 70.2*

Malachi 4:1, 3, also speaks of the same day, when "all the proud and *all that do wickedly* shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up." There is nothing in *Revelation 20* that is not taught here, either directly or indirectly. Directly, in that it says all the wicked shall be burned up *in the day that cometh,* that is in the coming or future judgment day. Indirectly, in that if *all* that do wickedly are burned up in that day they must have a resurrection to meet that fate. Many other declarations in the prophecies and Psalms are similar to this.*VDRU 71.1*

2 Peter 3:7-10 says the heavens and earth which are now are reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men; and in that day the fire shall melt the elements and the earth. This is not figurative language. It agrees with Malachi, and embraces all that is found in *Revelation 20*. The earth is melted-becomes a lake of fire; it is in "the day of judgment" unto which the unjust are "reserved;" it is the day of perdition of the ungodly, because in that day, and in that lake of fire, they shall be

burned up, root and branch-devoured. This destruction in the lake of fire is the second death: the only death to which their probation related; and to fulfill all and any of these scriptures a resurrection of the unjust is necessary.*VDRU 71.2*

Paul identifies this day of judgment as “the day of wrath,” in which “every soul of man that doeth evil” shall suffer “indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish.” *Romans 2:5-9*. And Job, using the same language that Peter afterward used on the same subject, said, “The wicked is *reserved* to the day of destruction,” and also, “they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath.” *Job 21:30*. Language could not more forcibly express the doctrine of *Revelation 20*.*VDRU 71.3*

2 Thessalonians 1:9 says the wicked “shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.” Not, as it has been often quoted, “banished” from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power, the possibility of which I cannot conceive; but punished with everlasting destruction, which destruction comes from the presence of the Lord. This destruction is by fire, as scores of texts clearly prove. *Revelation 20:9*, says the same thing. “Fire”—the agent of this destruction—“came down from God out of heaven and devoured them;” destroyed them; burned them up, root and branch. David says they shall consume away into smoke as the fat of lambs. *Psalm 37:20*. And thus from the glorious presence of the Lord their destruction comes down.*VDRU 72.1*

And in regard to that class embraced in “the rest of the dead,” *Revelation 20:5*, in distinction from the blessed and holy, *verse 6*, and on whom the second death is said to have power, the Saviour said of them, as evil-doers, they shall come forth from the graves to the resurrection of damnation. Paul said of them, there shall be a resurrection of the unjust; and the angel spoke to Daniel of them who sleep in the dust of the earth who shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt.*VDRU 72.2*

Now I appeal to the reader, Does *Revelation 20* exceed the statements of the several scriptures here noticed? Is it not in perfect harmony with them all? I am willing to leave it with the candid

inquirer for truth that *Revelation 20* teaches no new doctrine; not even a single idea which is not clearly brought to view in other scriptures. *VDRU 73.1*

In these remarks I have intimated that it is objected that *Revelation 20* should not be relied on as proof on this subject. I think I might safely leave it to the reader with the foregoing examination, yet I prefer to notice the positions of the objectors, and remove all distrust that has been placed upon that chapter. *VDRU 73.2*

It is assumed that, because Paul said he kept back nothing that was profitable, all that he did not say is unprofitable; and as he said nothing about a "second death" it is not profitable, and therefore not truth. [1]This objection, though used by opposers of a second resurrection, is not peculiar to them. It has been used on other subjects. It is wrong, and dangerous in tendency, whatever may be the object in urging it. Paul also said he had not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God. He did not shun to declare it-he did not keep it back, as if unwilling to give all his testimony. But this certainly cannot mean that every statement in the Bible is unprofitable except those written by Paul. He was at Ephesus for "the space of three years," preaching and laboring among them; and it was of this labor he spoke, and not of what he wrote to them; for we know that he wrote but little to the Ephesians. If the objectors know just what he did, and what he did not, preach during those three years, then they are competent to say whether he ever said anything about the second death in his ministry at Ephesus; otherwise they are not. *VDRU 73.3*

The prophets and evangelists and other apostles say many things that Paul did not write. Are they all unprofitable? Such a construction of Paul's language is a great perversion. Indirectly he taught a second death in such statements as this; "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die." If this refers to temporal death it is *equally true* that if we live after the Spirit we shall die! Then what force is there in his declaration? "They that sow to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption." Now our opponents say the wicked have this fulfilled in them already; they have suffered their penalty; they have seen corruption. But Inspiration says, "David fell on sleep and saw corruption." Is he also numbered with them that fail of everlasting life, because he saw corruption? The truth is, all see corruption

alike-all die the first death; the righteous “reap life everlasting” in the resurrection; they are “raised in incorruption.” The wicked “reap corruption” in their resurrection, because it is a “resurrection of damnation”-a resurrection whose partakers are subject to the second death. If we live after the Spirit, we shall escape that death-we shall live. But if we live after the flesh, we shall die a death that they will not die who live after the Spirit. Living after the flesh or after the Spirit has no influence whatever over temporal death; therefore that is not the death to which our probation relates, and not the death referred to in these scriptures. Many quotations of like import might be given from Paul’s writings. See also comments already made on “the day of wrath.” *VDRU 74.1*

2. It is assumed that the first resurrection is not a resurrection first in *order,* but the “chief resurrection,” as the word may be so translated. *Life from the Dead,* p. 70. Granting that it may, important considerations forbid its being so translated here. It is the word translated *first* when *order* is expressed, as in *1 Thessalonians 4:16*: “The dead in Christ shall rise first.” *Acts 3:26*: “Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you.” *Chap. 13:46*: “It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you.” And many others. And it is proved to mean first in order in *Revelation 20:5*, by the context. It is the first resurrection in distinction from that of “the rest of the dead,” who do not live again till a thousand years afterward. The connection also speaks of “the second death,” which involves a second resurrection, inasmuch as that death has no power on those who rise in the first resurrection. *VDRU 75.1*

3. It is asserted that the first clause of *verse 5* is apocryphal: “But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished.” But this sentence exactly corresponds with the connection in every respect. The *Emphatic Diaglott* remarks on the omission of this from the Vatican Manuscript, “These words were probably omitted by oversight by Vat. MS., as they are found in a, b, c,-though not in the Syriac.” Griesbach, than whom there is no higher authority on such questions, says it should be retained. The evidence, both internal and external, is in its favor. The application of this text by Elds. Storrs and Curry, I have noticed. *VDRU 75.2*

4. It is affirmed that the term “second death” is figurative, and refers, not to the wicked, but to “death and hell,” and “the lake of fire.” It seems unnecessary to say, I am astonished at such “criticisms.” Thus I quote:*VDRU 76.1*

“It may be answered, What and when’ is the second death of death and hell, if death and hell die not once? certainly not twice.”*VDRU 76.2*

Similar to this is the exposition I heard a preacher of that faith once give; “And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This [the lake of fire] is the second death.” And then he affirmed that it did not refer to the wicked, but to the lake of fire! If death and hell were cast therein, all who were under the dominion of death and hell were cast therein. The lake of fire is the second death-not to the lake of fire, which is nonsense, but-to *whosoever* was not found written in the book of life. If such declarations appear to partake more of the spirit of caviling than of reverential reasoning, let us attribute it to the necessities of the theory; for I have never met with a teacher of that faith who I thought would willingly harbor such a spirit. But I must think they appreciate the necessities of their system when they write and speak thus. A more careful examination of the Scriptures would obviate the difficulty in their minds. *Verse 6* says the second death has no power on the blessed an? holy. Of course it has power on such as are not blessed and holy. This determines who are the subjects of the second death. Also *chap. 2:11*. They who do not overcome will be *hurt* of it.*VDRU 76.3*

5. It is said again that no claim should be asserted on the phrase, “second death,” as it is found only in the book of Revelation, a book so highly figurative that no doctrine should be based on it. I hope that reverence for the Giver of the book of Revelation may yet correct this impression in the minds of the objectors. His words are these: “Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein.” It is the more surprising to read such an objection when made by those who claim to be “Adventists;” as it has long been a standing objection against their whole faith, and a valid one, too, if it is of any force whatever. What would William Miller have done with such an objection? or what would he have accomplished had he admitted it?

“Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.” The book of Revelation is the only book that describes the seven last plagues; shall we therefore say they will never be? Many things might be noticed which it alone, of all the books of the Bible, expressly mentions. Considering the subject and scope of the book, to reveal the appearing of Jesus and the consummation of God’s purposes towards this earth and its inhabitants, it is the book of all books to which we should look for information on judgment scenes and destinies. One very important thing stated in this book is, that if any one takes away from its words, his part shall be taken out of the book of life. Let us then be careful how we take any position to discredit its testimony; for we might as well entirely take away its words, as to cause men to discredit them, or to take away their force and power. *VDRU 77.1*

I will now examine the direct Scripture argument of those who oppose the doctrine of the resurrection of the unjust. The texts quoted are few in number, and far from having that direct bearing on the question that the texts have which I have quoted to prove the doctrine. I quote them in full. *VDRU 78.1*

Job 21:32: “Yet shall he be brought to the grave, and remain in the tomb.” *VDRU 78.2*

No one who believes the Bible denies that the wicked shall die, and that their death shall be irrecoverable; but we affirm, on the authority of the Scriptures, that it is the second death. The above text is immediately after Job’s declaration that the wicked shall *know* of his reward, *verse 19*, which is not fulfilled in this life; he shall *see* his destruction when he “shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty;” *verse 20*; but he prospers in the world, and “dieth in his full strength, being wholly at ease and quiet;” *verse 23*; which proves that he neither *sees* nor *knows* of his destruction or the wrath of the Almighty in this present death; this is too plain and positive to be evaded; but, “he is reserved to the day of destruction; they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath;” *verse 30*. Then follow the words of the text: “Yet shall he be brought to the grave, and remain in the tomb.” Such is its connection, and in such order I expect it will be literally fulfilled; and I am astonished that opposers of the resurrection of the unjust should press it into a service so

foreign to its import. The whole chapter is in perfect harmony with the scriptures quoted to prove that the evil-doers shall come forth from the graves to the resurrection of damnation; and that "every soul of man that doeth evil" shall suffer "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," in "the day of wrath."*VDRU 78.3*

And it is true, also, that the wicked shall "remain in the tomb" when the righteous are raised. Both the length of time, and the consequence of their remaining after the righteous are raised, are sufficient to make such a declaration an important part of revelation. The length of time is great-a thousand years. The consequence is all-important; they who remain in the tomb when the righteous are resurrected will be subjects of the second death. Take it in every aspect, it gives no countenance to the inferences of our opponents.*VDRU 79.1*

Psalm 49:19, 20: "He shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall never see light. Man that is in honor and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish."*VDRU 79.2*

In regard to the contrast in *verse 15*, "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave," no one will contend that the wicked are *redeemed* from the *power* of the grave, any more than the prisoner is redeemed from the power of the prison when he is brought into court to receive his sentence. "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." If they are brought forth to the day of wrath, it is because the law holds them under condemnation; and the law holds them because sin is upon them; they died with sin in their hearts. A resurrection to damnation and the second death in the day of wrath is rather small indication of victory over death and the grave.*VDRU 80.1*

All that is claimed on the text quoted above, has to be assumed. It is assumed that the word "light" refers to a re-living for any length of time, or for any purpose whatever; and that their being like the beasts that perish, is in the special point that they will not be raised from the dead, even to the execution of the judgment. They are like the beasts that perish in having no higher object in life than the beasts have, and, as the beasts, they will ultimately perish. But they *are not* like the beasts that perish in being on probation, in being

morally responsible, and thereby being subject to judgment and punishment for their conduct. How this theory does constantly run into the arms of Universalism in regard to personal responsibility! And their position on the text is not only a mere inference, but a very unjust one; as they lose sight of the actual likeness to the beasts, and then quote it to prove a likeness where there is a well-known difference. If such unwarranted inferences are to set aside such declarations as are found in *John 5:28, 29*; *Acts 24:15*, and *Daniel 12:2*, there is very little use to try to settle Bible questions of evidence.*VDRU 80.2*

Isaiah 26:13, 14: "O Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us; but by thee only will we make mention of thy name. They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish."*VDRU 81.1*

There are at least two evident reasons why the claim put forth on this text is not warranted. It is not certain that it refers to the resurrection or non-resurrection of the dead at all; but that it only states that the "lords" who had dominion over them should not rise to exercise dominion over them any more. And, were it proved or admitted that it refers to the subject in question, it is yet far from appearing that it is already fulfilled. The same prophet, speaking of the destiny of the wicked, says: "The inhabitants of the earth are burned." *Chap. 24:6*. This is as definite, and the same in tense, as the text in question; but it remains to be fulfilled. See *verses 1-5*. The text says, "Thou hast visited and destroyed them." *Chap. 24:22*, says they shall be gathered as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and "visited after many days." Their visitation and destruction will be in the great day of wrath. Many texts speak of the destruction of the wicked as already past, if we remove them from the page of prophecy and make history of them; but by so doing, they are perverted, and put in direct conflict with the plainest statements of the New Testament. If we take them as they are, as prophecies, they will harmonize with the words of the Saviour and his apostles, and with all the Scriptures on the subject of "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."[1]On these points, see also article by Geo. Storrs, in appendix.*VDRU 81.2*

Isaiah 43:16, 17: “Thus saith the Lord, ... which bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and power; they shall lie down together, they shall not rise; they are extinct, they are quenched as tow.”*VDRU 82.1*

Were the passages in *John 5*; *Acts 24*, etc., no more intimately related to the subject than this, we should no more be surprised that our opponents should set them aside as figurative or irrelevant. The chariot, the horse, the army, the power, lie down together, they shall not rise; therefore there will be no resurrection of the unjust! Words cannot express our astonishment that such a text as this should be quoted as a plain, literal denial of the resurrection of evil-doers, and *John 5:28, 29*; *Revelation 20:5, 6*, and others, should be set aside as “figurative,” as having no bearing on the subject of the resurrection! The power of an army, and the army itself, as an army, may be destroyed without destroying half the individuals composing it. Were they all cut off, so that the army could never again appear, they might all be raised “to the judgment of the great day” without conflicting with that fact. I pray that I may never be found advocating a doctrine which needs to be sustained by such a use of the Scriptures.*VDRU 82.2*

Jeremiah 51:39: “In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, saith the Lord.”*VDRU 83.1*

Does this text forbid the idea, so plainly revealed in the Bible, of the “wicked suffering the second death?” or coming “forth from the graves to the resurrection of damnation,” and to utter destruction? Does it even *seem* to contradict the plain testimonies of the word of God in favor of the resurrection of the unjust? If it does, I have not the ability to perceive it.*VDRU 83.2*

Hosea 8:14: “They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy god, O Dan, liveth; and, The manner of Beersheba liveth; even they shall fall and never rise up again.”*VDRU 83.3*

Do the words “fall” and “rise up” refer to death and the resurrection? It certainly does not appear in the text or context. Or if the words do so refer, may it not refer to the second death in the lake of fire, from which there is no rising? And this is quoted to prove that the

evildoers will not come forth from the graves, to a resurrection to judgment and the second death, by the very ones who affirm that *John 5:28, 29*, do not refer to the resurrection at all! Strange consistency, indeed! And these are the "positive proofs" on that side of the question.*VDRU 83.4*

But a few expressions in the New Testament, often quoted, remain to be noticed. I will introduce them by the following quotation:*VDRU 84.1*

"Add to this the positive testimony, 'He that believeth not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him,' *John 3:36*, and we think we are fully justified in saying the resurrection of evil-doers does not embrace being made alive, and is used (*John 5:29*), in a sense not literal, *i. e.,* the wicked have no life by their resurrection, whatever that term here imports." *Life from the Dead*, p. 41.*VDRU 84.2*

Why may we not affirm that *John 3:36*, is not literal, and it therefore cannot contradict the positive statement of *chap. 5:28, 29*? or does the decision of such points belong to our opponents exclusively? Hitherto they have talked as though that were the case. But I shall claim that we have the advantage on these texts in this respect: that the words in *John 5:28, 29*, are literal and unqualified, as every expression in them and their connection proves, while those in *chap. 3:36*, not only admit of, but, taken in connection with other passages, absolutely demand, qualification. Compare that text with *chap. 6:53*: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, *ye have* no life *in you*." Were they therefore dead at that time? Oh, no! replies our opponent, it means they have not *eternal* life. A very important explanation; and now suppose we read *John 3:36*, in the same manner: He that believeth not shall not see *eternal* life; and this is doubtless correct; for the same verse says, "He that believeth on the Son hath *everlasting life*." So everlasting or eternal life is the life which they have not, and shall not see. I accept the explanation; it expresses my faith on both these texts, and leaves them both in harmony with the plain testimony of *chap. 5:28, 29*, and other texts of like import.*VDRU 84.3*

Again, let us look at *chap. 8:51*: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a

man keep my saying *he shall* never see death." Does this mean that the followers of Jesus shall not die-that they never have died? Oh, no! this too must have its explanation. I use their own words, as I heard them from one of the ablest speakers of that faith: "Shall never see death, that is, so as to be retained thereby, or past recovery; they shall not die so as to remain dead." Your other explanation I admitted; the context and the sense of the text itself demand it. But I do not admit this construction; for I do not think it is just. I do not believe the Saviour referred to that death which the saints do see, or "taste of," *verse 52*. Has not Abel tasted death, or seen death, as actually as any person can? Or is not six thousand years in the grave long enough to taste of death? But there is a death-the second death-of which Jesus' followers shall never taste, and to this alone our probation relates, and to this alone this scripture refers; for it is a death the seeing of which is contingent on a certain course of action, which is not the case with present or Adamic death.*VDRU 85.1*

But as this is fatal to the non-resurrection theory, we will not be so ungenerous as to take it utterly from them if by any possibility they can claim it; only if they persist in claiming such a method of interpretation as just, we shall insist on the privilege of using it also. Then when it says of a certain class, they shall never see death, it means, so as to remain dead. And so also, when it says of another class, they shall never see life, it means, so as to remain alive! They shall not live again so as to continue to live, or not be subject to the second death. But this is equally fatal to their theory, and they lose on either side, unless they claim that this method of interpretation belongs exclusively to them! I admit that it belongs to them by *invention*, for I should never have thought of it if they had not adopted it. And now I repudiate it, as not giving the true sense of the Scriptures. But, if it is not just, they should not use it; if they still claim that it is just, we are entitled to its use. And the sum of it is this: If they renounce the interpretation, then *John 8:51*, must of necessity be referred to the second death, which is fatal to their whole theory; but if they insist on the interpretation, then we shall apply it to their proof texts, and so deprive them of even the appearance of evidence on those texts. So far as the *argument* is concerned, I care not which side they choose-they lose all. But so far as the *truth* is concerned, I choose to use the Scriptures in their

obvious sense, and yet preserve the harmony of the whole. And I shall therefore treat these texts as not referring to temporal or Adamic death, or to life in the resurrection of damnation; but the second death and to life everlasting.*VDRU 86.1*

It is further objected to the literality of the resurrection in *John 5:28, 29*, that the original of graves is not *hades*, or the word usually translated grave in the New Testament. This objection was certainly raised by somebody who knew the difference of the two Greek words; and I have heard it urged with all assurance, as though it were a most important fact in this controversy. The original word in *John 5:28*, is mnemeiois; and now in respect to the bearing of this fact on the question:*VDRU 87.1*

1. The words grave, tomb, and sepulcher, unitedly occur 48 times in the English Version, according to Cruden. Thus, grave 8 times; tomb 8 times; sepulchre 32 times.*VDRU 87.2*

2. The Greek word *hades* is translated grave just *once*. It is never translated tomb or sepulcher. So much for the use of that word. Its proper signification is not grave.*VDRU 87.3*

3. The word sepulcher is translated five times from the Greek *taphos;* and this word is never translated tomb or grave.*VDRU 87.4*

4. All the other occurrences of these three words are from the same Greek word that is used in *John 5:28*; thus, sepulcher 27 times; tomb 8 times; and grave 7 times; making the use of the Greek for grave, tomb, and sepulcher, as translated in our version, *mnema* 42 times; *taphos* 5 times; and *hades once*. "I wot that through ignorance ye did it;" but ignorance is not always an excuse for persistently affirming that to be true which you cannot know is true. For the use of *mnema* look at such texts as *Matthew 27:52, 53*: "And the graves [*mnema*] were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves [*mnemeion*]. *Acts 2:29*: "David is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher [*mnema*] is with us unto this day." And so *John 5:28*: "All that are in the graves [*mnemeiois*] shall hear his voice and come forth."*VDRU 88.1*

While speaking of the use of the Greek, it may be well to notice a

change of translation to accommodate the theory in question, which, I think, is a perversion. I refer to the rendering of *krimatos* in *Acts 24:25*, and krinein in *chap. 7:31*, *rule* instead of *judge*. The definition of these words is "judge" or "judgment." Greenfield says they are tropically used for rule, "since in the East the king is judge." So that, even then, these words are associated with *ruling*, only as ruling is associated with *judgment*. The common English Version is strictly correct. And in this change will be noticed the tendency of that theory, to which I have before called attention, to follow the old beaten track of Universalism in its efforts to obliterate from the Scriptures all ideas of a future judgment.*VDRU 88.2*

Again, it is said that the term "sleep" is never used "in the New Testament" in reference to the wicked in death. This is a mere catch; the same spirit that dictated the New Testament, dictated also the Old. *Jeremiah 51:39*, and *Daniel 12:2*, are correct translations of the original, and both refer to the state of the wicked in death. The former is much used as a non-resurrection text, in which the LXX have*hupnos* which is also used in the New Testament. A literal rendering from the Septuagint would be, "Sleep a sleep eternal." *Daniel 12:2*, embraces both classes, righteous and wicked, in death, and calls it sleep. Here the LXX have*katheudo*, which is also used in the New Testament; for example, see *1 Thessalonians 5:10*, "Whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."*VDRU 89.1*

A distinction is not only claimed on the word "sleep," but also on the word "death." We have seen that no such distinction exists in regard to "sleep;" let us examine the claim on the word "death." I quote:*VDRU 89.2*

"Death is either *extinction* of life, or a *suspension* of the functions of life. Death as a penalty, *i. e.,* as 'the wages of sin,' is extinction of life. Such a death none but the unpardoned die; it is the death of those who 'die in their sins,' and hence *'are perished.'* See *1 Corinthians 15:17, 18*, and also *John 8:21, 24*. Such a death all impenitent and unbelieving men do die; their life is extinct, and they 'find it' no more.*VDRU 89.3*

"Death, which is a suspension of life, the pardoned believer may

die: but his life is not extinct, for it 'is hid with Christ in God,' *Colossians 3:3*, and 'when Christ who is' their 'life shall appear, then shall' they 'also appear with him in glory.' Their life was not extinct, though for a time its functions were suspended, so as not to appear to themselves or others; but they were not dead under the penalty of the law; for that penalty was remitted in their case." *Life from the Dead,* p. 40.*VDRU 90.1*

And again:*VDRU 90.2*

"The bread of Heaven does not preserve, in all cases, from a temporary suspension of life; but it does preserve from that death which the wicked die, and from which there is no revival into life. In that sense believers shall 'not die.' Their life may be, and is, *suspended* in its active operation, for a time, but is never extinct." *Id*., p. 32.*VDRU 90.3*

Several points may be made against these statements:*VDRU 90.4*

1. They are directly contradicted in the same work by the author's theory of the "blood life" as a forfeit to the law. He says:*VDRU 90.5*

"Thus the claim of the law is not given up, nor relaxed, but the blood or animal life is eternally lost by every sinner, and never recovered." *Id*., p. 93.*VDRU 90.6*

That these remarks are intended to hold good in regard to all who have incurred condemnation by sin, saints as others, is evident from what follows:*VDRU 90.7*

"The blood life never is restored; the forfeiture of that is final; justice claims and holds it; but a new life-element is given by virtue of union with Christ.... Man's natural life is forfeited or lost by sin. That life perishes forever, and justice holds it as 'the wages of sin;' but another life-element is introduced for 'the dead,' by means of one who took his place."*VDRU 91.1*

Now if that theory be correct, the only death the righteous can suffer is the loss of this "animal or blood life;" but this is exactly the life the wicked lose. How is it, then, that the saints "do not die that death which the wicked die?" And how is it that their life is only

"suspended," and "never extinct," if it be also true that the only life they can lose "perishes forever," is "eternally lost," and "never recovered?" The whole theory is inconsistent and self-contradictory.*VDRU 91.2*

2. The reference to *Colossians 3:3*, is a misapplication, for it is spoken to those yet in possession of natural life, whose death consisted in "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," not natural death; this is further proved by their "being buried with Him in baptism," not in the grave. *Chap. 2:11, 12*.*VDRU 91.3*

3. It represents the wicked as *perishing* in death, in distinction from the righteous, whose vital functions are only *suspended.* But this distinction is contrary to the plain averments of the Scriptures. See the following passages:*VDRU 91.4*

Ecclesiastes 7:15: "There is a just man that perishes in his righteousness."*VDRU 92.1*

Isaiah 57:1: "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart."*VDRU 92.2*

Luke 11:50, 51: "That the blood of all the prophets from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple," etc.*VDRU 92.3*

Chap. 13:33: "For it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."*VDRU 92.4*

This *suspension* theory is utterly irreconcilable with the Scriptures, as it is with their own statements. Why not put in a plea for Cain against the charge of murder, on the ground that Abel has not died; his life is not extinct; that it is only a case of "*suspended animation?"* Surely the plea is a just one if the sentiments of the foregoing extracts be true. And again, can the righteous ever have a resurrection "from the dead," if they have never been dead? Can they ever "live again" who have never entirely ceased to live? For if death does not *extinguish* life, a resurrection cannot be to *restore* it.*VDRU 92.5*

And once more, is there not a strong savor of the old-fashioned

"immortal-soul" doctrine in these extracts? I think the author of the memorable "Six Sermons" made a future life contingent on *the resurrection of the dead.* But the foregoing extracts clearly make future life contingent upon *not becoming entirely dead.* If life is once extinguished, it is "lost forever!" This is following Prof. Bush in the denial of any resurrection: the wicked will not be raised, and the righteous *cannot be,* for they never fully die! *VDRU 92.6*

A few words on the order of the judgment may be necessary in this connection. It is clearly revealed in the word of God that the saints are raised immortal, incorruptible. They are not raised and immortalized afterwards; but "raised in incorruption," "raised in glory;" "raised in power;" "raised a spiritual body;" "the dead shall be raised incorruptible." *1 Corinthians 15:42, 43, 44, 52*. And as immortality, or eternal life, is the gift of God in the gospel, the reward of the righteous, it is evident their judgment precedes their resurrection, as it would be absurd to suppose that they receive their reward before their judgment. And this gives us to understand that there is a difference between *the judgment,* either for or against a party, and *the execution* of its decisions. From this it has been argued that there will be no judgment of determination or investigation after the resurrection of the saints. But that is deciding the case on a part of the testimony. Paul says the saints shall judge the world, and they shall judge angels; and this judgment is beyond "this life." *1 Corinthians 6:2, 3*. The same also is proved by *chap. 4:5*: "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come." But Peter and Jude both say that the unjust and the fallen angels are reserved to the judgment of the great day. In that day the saints sit in judgment on them; and therefore they judge the world of the ungodly and the fallen angels after their own judgment is past. That is, the judgment of the wicked takes place during the thousand years between the two resurrections; and the execution of the judgment is after the thousand years. All the Scripture declarations of these solemn truths; all their descriptions of the events connected with "the judgment of the great day," are but a mere farce, idle words, if the theory of the non-resurrection of the wicked be true. The dead, according to their view, are not condemned *to die,* but *to not live again.* But Job says of the wicked that God "rewardeth him and *he shall know it.* His eyes shall see his destruction, and he shall drink of the wrath of the Almighty." Is it

consistent to apply this to natural death, to that which occurs *before* the Judgment of the great day? and to affirm that he shall neither see nor know anything about his destiny after the decision is rendered? He shall see and know of that decision and his destruction, because he shall be brought forth to the day of wrath. This day is definitely located in the New Testament, and to this day the ungodly are reserved to be punished.*VDRU 93.1*

Much stress is laid on *Romans 5*, on the ground that it speaks of "justification to life," only of the righteous. Were that proved, or admitted, I cannot see that it warrants their inferences; as it does not contradict what is elsewhere said of the resurrection of the unjust and the second death. As before remarked, the silence of any one passage on a doctrine is no evidence against it while there are other passages that speak of it. They infer much from *Romans 5*, but an inference which is contradicted by the plain testimony of other passages, should not be entertained for a moment.*VDRU 94.1*

Many other points might be noticed; but I think I have now examined those most directly bearing on the question, and presented sufficient evidence to guide the inquiring into the way of truth. I have tried to examine this subject with care in all its bearings. I have read and heard all I possibly could on that side of the question. I know that I have no prejudice against their writers and speakers. No individual connected with the cause and doctrines of the second advent of the Lord has been more highly esteemed by me than Elder George Storrs. And I esteem him highly still; I believe him to be an honest, earnest advocate of what he considers sacred truth. But on this subject I think he is in error; and with that error I consider it my duty to deal faithfully. And the same I may say of Elder Rufus Wendell, of Salem, Mass., with whom I have formed a very happy acquaintance. And so I might speak of others. Nor do I think my feelings have been those of prejudice against the doctrine. I have too long occupied unpopular ground to be frightened with names or appearances. But I have both read and heard with a strong and constantly increasing conviction that they were in error; and I now appeal to what I have written, as proof that my convictions were well grounded. When I read the plain, positive testimony of Christ and his apostles in regard to the resurrection of

the unjust to condemnation and the second death, of the great day of wrath to which they are reserved to be punished, I considered it both a right and duty to regard everything conflicting with their statements as error, and to put it closely to the proof. I think that the advocates of the doctrine in question have entirely failed to prove their position, and I am obliged to reject their faith as dangerous in its tendency and results. *VDRU 95.1*

I am well aware also that the controversy on this subject is but just begun. Very little has yet been written by Second Adventists in favor of the resurrection of the wicked. Some of its opponents have therefore regarded themselves as entitled to the ground; and I have seen too much of their zeal and energy to expect them to yield it without a struggle. But I have no fear for the result. I am satisfied that the more thoroughly the ground is canvassed-the more closely it is contested, the more clearly will the truth shine out. *VDRU 96.1*

I have done no more than my duty in writing these pages. I deeply regret that I have done it no better. Much of this has been written under a pressure of other business, in traveling, preaching, etc. I have done what I could under my circumstances, and prayerfully send it forth, hoping it may do some good to God's dear people and the cause of Bible truth. *VDRU 96.2*

APPENDIX

J. T. Walsh was once associate editor of the *Bible Examiner*, and while so acting he embraced the view of the non-resurrection of the wicked. This led to his being dismissed from that position, and in remarking on this subject, Eld. Storrs wrote the following article. It was published in vol. v, pp. 43, 44. Mr. Walsh afterward returned to the belief of the immortality of the soul.*VDRU 97.1*

I would not be misunderstood in publishing this article. It is not for the purpose of placing Eld. Storrs in opposition to himself; a motive so unworthy I utterly disclaim. But I value the argument; it is clear in statement, and forcible in conclusion. Nor yet do I think it any discourtesy to publish it. In giving it to the public, its author made it public property; and whoever is pleased with it is at liberty to quote it.*VDRU 97.2*

"We have no intention of spending our time for a year and a half in discussing so fruitless a topic, and one which we are clearly satisfied is opposed both to the spirit and letter of the Bible. If any man can give us as plain a text that men are immortal by creation as we have that *'all* that are in the graves *shall come forth*, ... they that have done good *and they that have done evil,'* then we will confess our error in ever having preached or printed the 'Six Sermons.' Here we leave the topic of the non-resurrection of wicked men and little children; for the theory we oppose denies the resurrection of infants, *except possibly the infants of believers*. According to it, there is a bare *possibility*, nothing more, that our sleeping children 'shall come again from the land of the*VDRU 97.3*

7 enemy;' and it is quite *uncertain* whether, to them, *'Jesus is the resurrection and the life'*. The method of interpreting Scripture on which this theory depends, unsettles all faith in the Bible, and saps the foundation of Christianity. Prophetic Scripture is made by it to speak of events past at the time. Because the prophets speak as if God had *already done* what he will finally do, it is inferred there shall be no resurrection of the wicked. For example, the Psalmist says, '*Thou hast* destroyed all them that go astray from thee.' W. says, 'There is no intimation of a resurrection, ... for the characters are utterly consumed and destroyed.'*VDRU 97.4*

“The question here all turns on *time*. *When* are ‘all that go astray destroyed’? If he is correct in his theory, David lived in a *happy time;* all the wicked *had been* destroyed-not one was *then* left; for David says, ‘Thou *hast’* done it; not, Thou *wilt* do it. Thus the truth of God is turned into a fable, and Christianity is a falsehood. Do you ask, How so? We answer, Several centuries before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, Isaiah said, ‘Unto us a child is born, ... the government shall be upon his shoulder,’ etc. Now, says the Jew, ‘It is plain the Messiah was born long before Jesus of Nazareth; Jesus cannot, therefore, be the Messiah of God.’ Again the same prophet said of Messiah, seven hundred years before the birth of Jesus, ‘He *is* despised, ... we *did* esteem him smitten of God, ... with his stripes we *are* healed, ... the Lord *hath laid* on him the iniquity of us all, ... he *was* oppressed,’ etc. Hence it is as plain a matter of fact, to a Jew, that Jesus cannot be the Messiah, as it is to the author of *‘Anastasis’* that the wicked will have no resurrection, from such *texts* as that in which David said, ‘Thou *hast* destroyed all them that go astray from thee.’ And we think the argument of the Jew is as well founded and as forcible as that of him who contends that there is no resurrection of the wicked because their future and final destination is spoken of as already past. To us it seems clear that ‘blindness in part has happened to’ the authors of such interpretations. ‘God calls things that be not as though they were,’ on account of the certainty of the accomplishment of his purposes; thus he said, ‘I have made thee a father of many nations,’ when as yet he had no child. *VDRU 98.1*

“This principle, understood and applied, subverts all the fine-spun theory of no-resurrection of the wicked, and shows that what is spoken on the subject of their being destroyed, and not rising, in the various texts relied upon to support the Pharisaic doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked, relate to their final destruction *after* ‘the Judgment of the great day,’ unto which the wicked are *‘reserved;’* when, as Job says, *‘The wicked shall be brought forth to the day of wrath;’* and he affirms, they are *‘reserved to the day of destruction,’ Job 21:30*; and Jesus Christ says, they *‘shall come forth from the graves’* to condemnation or ‘damnation;’ after which the testimony of John the apostle is, they shall be ‘cast into the lake of fire;’ surely that is ‘*the day* of destruction.’ Let men beware of deluding their souls with the vain fancy that they will lie in their

graves in a state of insensibility to the Judgment and the awful execution of the sentence that is to follow; vain hope; *strong delusion*.*VDRU 99.1*

"We have called the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked a 'Pharisaic doctrine.' Our authority for this, assertion is Josephus and the 'Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, by John Kitto, D. D., F. S. A.,' an English work of great research. The Pharisees maintained that 'those who had lived virtuously,' and they *only,* have power to '*revive and live again.'* This fact is worthy of serious attention, as the advocates of the non-resurrection of the wicked, who have recently come up, try hard not only to destroy the force of Christ's words (*John 5:28, 29*), but to make Paul's words (*Acts 24:15*) to mean only that the Pharisees *allowed* there would be a resurrection of the just and unjust, while the apostle did not. The truth is, the Pharisees 'allowed' there would 'be a resurrection of the dead,' but *denied* that it embraced the *'unjust.'* Paul affirms his *expectation*—for that is all the Greek word *elpida,* translated *hope,* in this text necessarily means—'that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, *both* of the just *and of the unjust;'* thus agreeing with the testimony of Jesus, that *all* in the graves shall come forth—good and evil; and the 'two witnesses' strike down the Pharisaic doctrine of the just *only* being raised from the dead.*VDRU 99.2*

"We have said much more than we intended when we commenced this notice; and we have done so, that all might understand that we have no fear to meet all that can be said, however subtle the argument may be managed. A Jew called on us, not long since, to prove to us from the Scriptures that it was impossible that Jesus could be the Messiah; and his argument was full as strong as the argument by which it is attempted to establish a limited resurrection; and, as we have before remarked, they both have *one principle* in interpreting the Scriptures."-*Bible Examiner,* Vol. v, pp. 43, 44.*VDRU 100.1*

PUBLICATIONS

The Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mich., issues the following periodicals: *VDRU 100.2*

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, weekly This sheet is an earnest exponent of the Prophecies, and treats largely upon the Signs of the Times, the Second Advent of Christ, the Nature of Man, the State of the Dead, the End of the Wicked, the Saints' Inheritance, the Hope of the Gospel, the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus Christ. Terms, $2.00 a year in advance. *VDRU 100.3*

The Youth's Instructor, monthly. This is a high-toned, practical little sheet, devoted to moral and religious instruction, adapted to the wants of youth and children. Terms, 25 cents a year in advance. *VDRU 100.4*

The Health Reformer, monthly. This journal is devoted to an exposition of the laws of life, and the application of those laws in the preservation of health, and the treatment of disease. Terms, $1.00 a year in advance. Also, *VDRU 100.5*

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND TRACTS

	Price.	Post.
Tho'ghts on the Revelation,	$1.00	12c
Life Incidents,	1.00	12
Life of Eld. Joseph Bates,	1.00	12
Hymns and Tunes, morocco,	1.00	12
“”“ calf,	1.25	12
Sabbath Readings, muslin,	60	8
“” in 5 pamph's,	50	4
“” in 25 tracts,	40	4
Appeal to Youth, muslin,	40	4
“” in pamph't,	10	2
The Bible from Heaven,	25	4
Second Advent Keepsake,	25	4
“”“ gilt	40	4
Sermons on the Sab. & Law,	20	4
Discussion-Grant &Cornell,	20	2
Modern Spiritualism,	20	2
Review of Preble-Sabbath,	20	2
The Atonement, 20	2	
Review of Obj. to Visions,	20	2
The Three Messages,	15	2
Which? Mortal or Immortal,	15	2
Resurrection of the Unjust,	15c	2c
Brown's Review of Gilfillan,	10	2
The Seventh Part of Time,	10	2
Truth Found-Sabbath,	10	2
Prophecy of Daniel,	10	2
Date of the 70 weeks of *Daniel 9*, and 2300 days of *Daniel 8*,	10	2
Vindication of the Sabbath,	10	2
The Sanctuary & 2300 Days,	10	2
Key to Prophetic Chart,	10	2
Exposition of *Matthew 24*,	10	2
The Seven Trumpets,	10	2

Milton on State of the Dead,	5	2
Appeal to Baptists-Sabbath,	5	2
Bible Student's Assistant.	5	2
Sixteen Answers to Sixteen Objections to Advent Faith,	5	2

Also a Select Package of about twenty Tracts, upon different subjects, comprising 300 pages, by mail postpaid, 30 cts.*VDRU 100.6*

The Association furnishes Tracts at the Office, or will forward them by express or freight, 1600 pages for $1.00. Catalogues of all of our publications sent free on application.*VDRU 100.7*

Address, Review & Herald, *Battle Creek, Mich.**VDRU 100.8*